School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1315447

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

CHRISTIANITY ACCORDING TO S. LUKE

BS
259
C35

CHRISTIANITY ACCORDING TO S. LUKE

BY THE REV.

S. C. CARPENTER, B.D.

FELLOW AND TUTOR OF SELWYN COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE
EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE LORD BISHOP OF SOUTHWELL

LONDON
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1919

Lucas Syrus natione Antiochensis arte medicus discipulus apostolorum postea Paulum secutus usque ad confessionem eius serviens domino sine crimine. Nam neque uxorem umquam habens neque filios septuaginta annorum obiit in Bithynia plenus spiritu sancto.

Praefatio vel argumentum Lucae (*c.* 230).

A11346

School of Theology
at Claremont

TO THE PEOPLE OF S. LUKE'S CHURCH, CAMBRIDGE,
TO WHOM, BY REASON OF THE PRESENT NECESSITY,
THE AUTHOR HAS BEEN FOR TWO YEARS A MINISTER,
THIS STUDY OF THE GOSPEL OF THEIR PATRON SAINT,
WHICH HAS BEEN PARTLY WRITTEN IN MOMENTS BORROWED FROM
THEIR MORE IMMEDIATE SERVICE,
OF WHICH THEY HAVE HEARD A PART ALREADY FROM THEIR PULPIT,
IS INSCRIBED WITH GRATEFUL AND AFFECTIONATE REGARD.

PREFACE

This book has grown out of some lectures delivered at Cambridge in August 1915 to the members of the Vacation School of Biblical Studies. The lectures have been rewritten and considerably enlarged, and the volume now represents an attempt to describe with some fulness the meaning and historical background of the third Gospel. I have tried my best to make an independent examination of the subject, but I cannot hope that scholars will find in it much that is new to them. I had almost written "anything that is new," but it does occasionally happen that even very learned scholars allow themselves here and there to consider a text simply as a text, in isolation from its setting. Where this has in any degree been done, an attempt to portray the setting and to place the text against its real background may be of service. Let us by all means have historical criticism, but let it be genuinely historical. The truth is that the Gospels will not be understood unless two things are appreciated, the Palestinian environment of the events that are recorded in them, and the ecclesiastical, or Christian, environment of the Evangelists. Of these, the former has been carefully considered by modern writers, but the other is still sometimes neglected. It seems, therefore, that there is room for a study of S. Luke's Gospel as a Church document. And, if the personal touch may (in a Preface) be forgiven, I am glad to make an opportunity of saying that membership of Selwyn College has fortified, and, I trust, also clarified, a belief which I acquired in South London. The belief is that problems of theology, as of politics and other provinces of human thought, are at least most likely to be solved by such as will look at them with Christian eyes, while they are trying, with others, to live a Christian life.

Readers who are not familiar with New Testament criticism

will find that the book makes certain demands upon their patience, if it is to be used with profit, but I hope that they will not find it obscure or over-technical.

The magnitude and frequency of my obligation to previous writers are indicated in the foot-notes, but I am further indebted to Mr. Valentine-Richards, Fellow and Dean of Christ's College, who has most kindly read through a part of the proofs, and to Mr. S. R. Wareing, who has compiled the indices.

S. C. CARPENTER

SELWYN COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE
February 1919

CONTENTS

PART I

THE BACKGROUND

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	THE CHURCH AND THE GOSPELS	3
II.	S. LUKE AND S. PAUL	13
	NOTE ON THE "WE-SECTIONS" AND S. LUKE	19
III.	PENTECOST AND GALILEE	21
	NOTE ON THE CHRIST-MYTH THEORY	32
IV.	THE APOCALYPTIC BACKGROUND	34

PART II

THE PORTRAIT

V.	THE CONTENTS OF THE GOSPEL	63
VI.	THE CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL	74
VII.	THE APOCALYPTIC CHRIST	96
VIII.	THE SON OF MAN AMONG THE SONS OF MEN	110
IX.	THE SOURCES OF THE GOSPEL (1)	122
X.	THE SOURCES OF THE GOSPEL (2)	136
XI.	THE NATIVITY (1)	149
XII.	THE NATIVITY (2)	158
	NOTE ON THE READING IN iii. 22	173

PART III

THE WORKMANSHIP

XIII.	S. LUKE THE PSYCHOLOGIST	177
XIV.	S. LUKE THE ARTIST	189

CHAP. PAGE
XV. S. LUKE THE DEMOCRAT 203
XVI. S. LUKE THE UNIVERSALIST 212

NOTE ON THE DATE OF THE GOSPEL 229

NOTE ON THE "WESTERN" READINGS 231

INDEX OF PASSAGES OF S. LUKE'S GOSPEL REFERRED TO IN THE TEXT 233

GENERAL INDEX 237

PART I

THE BACKGROUND

CHAPTER I

THE CHURCH AND THE GOSPELS

Of the many dangers that beset the path of one who writes a book about the Bible, or any part of it, there are two which demand attention at the outset. In the first place, if we assume that the intention of the writer is to shew that the Bible has a modern application, he will be tempted, in his anxiety to commend the Book to a contemporary audience, to father upon Prophet or Evangelist some mere invention of his own. The following pages have not been planned in entire forgetfulness of the danger of that particular presumption. I greatly hope that in them the Evangelist will be heard speaking for himself. It is admitted, of course, that any appreciation of an ancient book, written in English and in the twentieth century, must owe something, good or bad, to the date and standpoint of the compiler, but it happens in the case of S. Luke that the ancient author comes more than half-way to meet us. If he be modern, as I believe he is, it will not be because he has been successfully modernized. He hardly even requires to be re-stated. Only, at most, to be re-translated.

The other danger is this. One tragic consequence of the multiplication of books about the Bible is that they are read, and the Bible is not read. The very thing that should have been for the wealth of the reader is for him an occasion of falling. The author of an "Introduction" to the Gospel of S. Luke has turned away his readers from the words of the Gospel that he thought to make known. He was minded to promote the "daily reading and weighing of the Scriptures," and he succeeds in providing a mean substitute. The remedy for the abuse is not altogether in the hands of the writer of the "Introduction," but the danger is one which he will do well to bear in mind.

Our object, then, is to throw S. Luke upon the screen. His editor, if the term may be used, does not particularly wish to correct him, or to supplement him, still less to apologize for him. But, inasmuch as the sin of "taking away" from the words of any of the Books of Revelation [1] is worse and less remediable than the sin of "adding" to them, therefore of all possible results of the writing of the present volume the most fatal would be to produce on readers the impression that they need not read S. Luke any more, because they know what he has to say. Second-hand theology is a widely circulated and by no means useless commodity, but second-hand religion, when the age of childhood is once passed, is a fond thing, vainly invented.

It will perhaps seem at first sight quite inconsistent with the foregoing remarks to say that S. Luke can only be understood when he is considered as a member of the Christian Church. Here, it will be thought, is the thin end of the ecclesiastical wedge. The Bible is not really being left to speak for itself.

The objection leads us at once to one of the great modern misunderstandings of Christianity. The impression having first of all been produced that Christianity consists of the Bible, it is then supposed that the Bible exists somehow *in vacuo*, hanging between earth and heaven, and that it originally appeared, like Melchizedek, on a sudden, without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life. And this is the more curious because the mistake in kindred connexions is generally avoided. No one imagines that the Book of Common Prayer can be considered apart from the Church of England, or that the Church of England can be considered apart from the main stream of historic Christianity, as it dates from Christ and His Apostles. No one proposes to estimate the value of such things as Baptism and Confirmation without some reference, expressed or implied, to the general truth of Christian theology. It is recognized that it is impossible to deal with Papal or Nonconformist questions without taking certain historical facts into consideration.

All this is admitted, and yet the attempt is made to treat the New Testament as if it were only a cause, and not also an effect.

[1] See Rev. xxii. 18 and 19.

The place of the New Testament in the chain of Christian evolution is a very great and very conspicuous place. But it did not make Christianity. On the contrary, Christianity made it.

The true course of events was this. With Christ, a new creative energy entered the world. When Gabriel, the angel, was sent unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, there occurred an act of God, from which there has flowed and is flowing an immense series of results. Thence came the Nativity and Ministry of Jesus, the Upper Room, the Cross, the victory of Easter, the Ascension. Thence came the Day of Pentecost, the Church, the Sacraments, the Bible, the Episcopate, the Creeds, the nineteen Christian centuries. Thence have come whatever of faith, or spiritual power, or faculty of prayer and worship may belong to ourselves or to any of our fellow-Christians. And thence will have come the repentance, the good resolutions, the Easter Communions, the mystic ecstasy, the Ordinations or the family worship of millions who are yet unborn. We do not nowadays pile "pyramids of doctrine on the apex of a single text." But inasmuch as Christianity is an historical religion, we are compelled, in the interests of the truth, to trace whatever Christian things have happened since Christianity began back to the time when it did begin, to the time when God did not abhor the Virgin's womb.

The New Testament is part of this vast stream of consequences. It is also itself, within the stream, a secondary cause. For the Church is an organism, not a machine. As soon as the group of documents that we now call the New Testament began to come into existence, it was found to be so full of real, creative life that it at once took a dominating place in the movement as an active and productive cause. As time went on and the first generations of believers died, its usefulness became greater and greater. It became indispensable. It enshrined and preserved the gracious memory that would otherwise have become indistinct. It made available for later generations the apostolic witness, and the apostolic interpretation of the supreme events. The New Testament has made it possible for Christians to have what in things of this world is almost always unattainable. It enables them to have their advantage in two ways at once. For the perfection of Our Lord's life and the power of His conquest over the grave have

been wrought into the fabric of the Church. The early Christians had Redemption, and we have it, stored in the Church for daily use. But also, in the Bible, it is captured and depicted, as fresh as it was on the day when it was born. Since the Church began, it has been for Christians the daily food of their salvation. There we use it, and yet, in the Bible, we can have it too. Moreover, that which can be said of the redeeming power of the Master can be said also, on the lower level, of the stimulating grace of the disciple. We use in the Church from day to day the frailty and the fealty of S. Peter, the sternness and sweetness of S. John; and we can have them, for our example and admonition, in the Bible.

But the Church is more than the Bible. Nothing can alter the fact that the New Testament is one of the possessions of the Church. The Church existed for a number of years without it. We can easily see now that its formation was the response to "divine inspiration," but at the time it seemed casual and haphazard. The writers of the Epistles, at least, had not the slightest idea that future generations would read their letters as they themselves read the Law and the Prophets. Their inspiration was unconscious. The Evangelists were rather more definitely aware than the Epistle-writers that posterity would read their books, but even they would have been startled beyond measure to learn that they were engaged in the composition of part of the Bible. S. Paul and others wrote their letters, and the Evangelists wrote their records, for the benefit of the Church or some part of it. They wrote as Churchmen to Churchmen about things with which Churchmen are concerned. Even the most superficial examination of S. Paul's first letter to the Church of Salonika, one of the earliest, if not the very earliest existing Christian document,[1] will shew that the author was writing out of the heart of a Christian environment. He begins by speaking in one breath of "God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ," and throughout he presupposes the existence of the Church.

It ought, therefore, to be a platitude to say that no book of the New Testament can be understood unless it is regarded as a

[1] Some critics now date Galatians before Thessalonians. According to Harnack's chronology the date of Thessalonians was eighteen years after the Crucifixion, and S. Paul's Conversion was about one year after the Crucifixion.

product of Church-life. But there is still much misconception on the subject. When we recall what is often said about "simple Bible teaching," or the views that are commonly held by English people about the Bible, and indeed what is sometimes written by very learned scholars—the statement still wears almost the aspect of a paradox. The case of S. Luke's Gospel is in this respect particularly instructive. It is in itself so interesting, and it appears on the surface to be so complete and self-contained a story that it seems perfectly able to stand on its merits. And so indeed it will, *if the scope of its own merits be fully understood.* For it is, in itself, actually and confessedly, a Church document. It claims to be, and is, an attempt by a Churchman of the second generation to utilize and co-ordinate the knowledge of the original generation of Churchmen and to put it at the disposal of his contemporaries, and possibly also of their successors. Its purpose was primarily to confirm the accuracy and to supplement the amount of what had been taught to Theophilus by the Church, and secondarily (this is not stated, but it is a certain inference) to enable other Churchmen to verify the truth of whatever religious instruction might have been given them. These purposes it has actually served, and still serves to-day.[1]

The book must therefore be judged as one of the early volumes of a long and still unfinished series. It must be judged not only in its contemporary background, but, in the largest sense of the word, historically, that is, as *scriptus et in tergo necdum finitus.*

It must be surveyed with the help of knowledge of ancient history and Church doctrine, if the survey is to be complete. As Dr. Sanday has said, "No great movement can be rightly judged only by its initial stages, or apart from the impression left by it upon the highest contemporary minds."[2] Dr. Sanday is pleading for freedom to apply the Fourth Gospel, to allow it to add its peculiar interpretative testimony to that of the Synoptists. But that is only one instance—though an outstanding, monumental

[1] "It is a great mistake to judge the Gospel story as a thing complete in itself. The Gospel story is only the Prologue to the history of Christianity. Not to go beyond the circle of the Canonical Evangelists, we know that one at least of the Four actually treated what we call the Gospel merely as the first volume of a larger work. S. Luke's point of view is surely the true one" (Burkitt in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 198). Cf. F. D. Maurice, *The Kingdom of Heaven*, p. xxxv.

[2] *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, 2nd ed., p. 247.

instance—of an immense process. The Christian Church as a whole has accepted S. Luke's volume as one of its canonical Gospels. It has found his picture—the picture of the Virgin-born Healer and Saviour of the World—to be adequate and satisfying as one of the accounts of the genesis of its own religion, and indeed of itself. If, therefore, any modern reader is disposed to question the adequacy of the Gospel, he must remember that he is questioning the verdict of Christendom. That verdict was considered and practically fixed during the years between the time of writing and some date before the middle of the second century,[1] and has been either tacitly or formally reasserted by every generation since. This does not mean that the modern critic will necessarily be found to be mistaken. Still less does it foreclose his right of criticism. But it creates a very high degree of probability that the Church on the whole has known its own business better than he does, and it unquestionably indicates the necessity of caution.[2]

And even if one is finally driven to question the authority of Christendom, it is the fundamental error of errors to neglect it. To neglect it is to neglect history. For, in the narrower sense of the word, historically it was the Church which first created a demand for S. Luke's Gospel, and then sanctioned it when written. And, in a wider sense of the word, it is, historically, the Church which delivers S. Luke's Gospel into our hands to-day. For Christian instruction is always given in the first instance by some representative of the Church. The attempt to produce conversions to Christianity by distributing copies of the Bible, even of the Gospels, is mistaken. I do not at all assert that it is a useless or mischievous thing to do. But it is not an adequate method of producing conversions.[3] And it was certainly not the method

[1] The *Diatessaron* of Tatian shews that by that time the Canonical Gospels were accepted as the four standard Gospels of the Church. Harnack, speaking of the collection of four Gospels, says that " this was done before the middle of the second century, perhaps long before " (*Luke the Physician*, p. 1).

[2] So Prof. Burkitt : " The fine instinct which reserved a place for the Gospel of Mark among the books of the New Testament shows the Catholic Church to have been wiser than her own writers, wiser than the heretics, wiser, finally, than most Biblical critics from S. Augustine to Ferdinand Christian Baur " (*Gospel History*, p. 261).

[3] The experience of Callista, in Newman's tale, to whom S. Cyprian gave a copy of S. Luke's Gospel, is a good illustration of the part legitimately played by the New Testament in the process of conversion.

of the Apostles. For even if the New Testament had been in existence in their time, they would not have begun their evangelization with it. They might have left copies behind them when they went away. They might conceivably have distributed copies during the course of the catechumenate.[1] They might further have found it useful to ask their disciples to look up references in passing, to use the New Testament, in fact, very much as the Church does now. But they would not have begun with it.

They would have begun—in fact it is certain that they did begin—with the thing that seemed to them all-important, the good news that expectations and desires, the expectations of the Jews and the desires of many Greeks, had been realized in the person of Jesus of Nazareth; they would add that they themselves were witnesses of His redeeming and victorious work, that He had gathered them into His family or body, and soon would welcome them to His Heavenly Kingdom; meantime the Christ-Spirit underlying their corporate life was available for others, and, finally, the invitation was now open to listen, to repent, to be instructed and baptized.[2] That was the method of Philip at Samaria, of Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, of Peter and all other Apostolic missionaries in all places to which they ever went. That is the method which the Church pursues now.[3] The proper modern procedure is the Apostolic procedure. The baptized child receives, as formerly the adult inquirer received, some elementary Christian teaching about God and Christ and being good. This is given either by the priest at the Little Catechism, or by the

[1] I.e., just as a modern teacher of, say, Hebrew might require his class to procure Hebrew Bibles at an early stage of their grammatical instruction, so they may turn over the pages, recognize a word here and there, and look forward to the time when they will be able to read it with understanding.

[2] Even at a still earlier stage, the stage not of the dissemination of Christian knowledge but of its birth, the same holds good. The original, creative events were enacted in the environment of that Jewish Church, of which the history is but the first volume of the continuous library of God's Revelation to man. Some such attempt as that which will be made in other chapters of the present work to sketch the background of the Gospel, the Semitic background of the events recorded by S. Luke and the Hellenic, yet sympathetic and, so to speak, philo-Semitic background of his record of them, is indispensable. Neither the events nor their treatment can be understood apart from knowledge of "the People of God."

[3] There is just one difference. The order of the Christian events has been changed by the custom of Infant Baptism, which the existence of Christian families very soon made a natural and normal thing. The Church status is now conferred at an early age.

teacher in the Sunday Kindergarten, or by the mother at home. Sometimes by all three. But in any case by the Church. As soon as he knows some prayers, and a hymn or two like "I love to hear the story," he is taken to Church, and is introduced to Christian worship. "Who is that?" "The priest." "What is he doing?" "He is standing at the altar, and doing what our Lord says we are to do." Then, presently, comes the reading of the Gospels. That is the true Christian order of events.

The Church is the original and permanent organism, the instrument of God. The Bible is one of the instruments of the Church. And the Evangelists realized this as well as anybody. Thus, while it can hardly be asserted that they had thought out completely the place that their own work would be likely to take in a permanent scheme, what is certain is that they did not assume any place for their work that did not belong to it. They desired to advance the cause of the Church and they were content that their work should be used or superseded as God might choose.

S. Luke, then, like all the other Evangelists, was first and foremost a Churchman. It would not be unreasonable to describe him as an "ecclesiastically minded layman." But the title must not be pressed. He was no more "ecclesiastically minded" than any other of the Evangelists. In fact, less so than the author of S. Matthew's Gospel. And if we bear in mind that he was a physician who accompanied S. Paul on missionary journeys, and that S. Paul was accustomed to class gifts of healing along with gifts of prophecy and the like as kindred gifts of ministration (1 Cor. xii. 9), it seems doubtful whether it is quite correct to call him a layman. His status was perhaps at least as clerical as that which was afterwards described as Minor Orders.[1]

But this is only a question of terms. What is meant is that S. Luke's Gospel, like all the other Gospels, arose in an ecclesiastical atmosphere. It happens that S. Luke himself supplies much of the evidence which proves this. For S. Luke was also the author of the Acts. It is likely enough that even before he began his Gospel he knew that he would follow it up with another book,

[1] In Philem. 24, S. Paul describes him as one of his *συνεργοί*. Many of the features of his writings suggest that he knew a good deal about preaching. See, for the Gospel, Hawkins in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 90–94.

and that he had already collected some of the later material.[1] And anyhow it is certain that, as he wrote his Gospel, he was thinking all the time of the great event which he records elsewhere, in the second chapter of his other book, namely, the Coming of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. That was for him the centre of gravity of the Christian religion. The Christian religion had begun with Jesus, but it was Pentecost which put the grace of Jesus into universal circulation. Without Pentecost it would never have reached Theophilus or even the Evangelist himself. And it was the Evangelist's knowledge of Pentecost, and his hourly dependence on its fruits, that made it seem worth while to him to reconstruct the tale of those Galilean events which preceded Pentecost and made it possible.

We shall see presently that this reconstruction was a recovery of what might otherwise have been lost or at least obscured. S. Luke's Gospel is in the first place a definite attempt—very striking on the part of a Pauline Christian—to recover the historic Jesus. And in the second place it is a step—it is very hard to say how far it is a conscious step—in the direction of recovering the environment, the thoroughly Jewish and also highly apocalyptic environment, in which the Master had actually lived. In so far as it was unconscious, the fact is a tribute to the simple truthfulness of the Evangelist. On the other hand, the more deliberate we suppose it to have been, the more notable is its evidence to his power as an historian of the Christian movement.

The examination of this attempted recovery will occupy the next three chapters. Its sources will be considered later. Meantime we may consider for a moment what the circumstances of S. Luke's own conversion most probably had been. We have some reason for supposing that he was converted through the agency of S. Paul. There is no actual proof of this, but the subsequent relations of the two men, and the way in which he speaks of S. Paul, and S. Paul of him, are best explained by supposing that he was one of those who owed to S. Paul "his own soul also."

Can we go even further, and say that S. Luke originally

[1] It has occasionally been held that he wrote Acts first and the Gospel afterwards. See Chase in *Cambridge Theological Essays*, pp. 380–381, 406 *n*.

became known to his friend in the capacity of a physician, that he was called in to heal some visitation of the " thorn in the flesh " or other infirmity, and that he was won, as many a physician has been won, by observing the spirit of his patient ? It is an attractive picture—the physician gradually yielding himself to the power by which his patient seems to be inspired, and in particular, perhaps, impressed by his notable ability to triumph over his own infirmities. If this was so, it is easy to imagine the course of events. On recovery, or, more probably, long before complete recovery, when the sick man ought to have been still in bed, he persuaded his doctor to seek initiation into the mystical society, which possessed, or rather was possessed by, the Spirit of Christ, the Great Healer and Saviour of the world.

But whether or no this was the actual beginning of S. Luke's Christian life, it is certain that he owed to S. Paul a very great debt. Our examination of S. Luke's environment has brought us to a point which demands a chapter to itself.

CHAPTER II

S. LUKE AND S. PAUL

THE object of this chapter is not to determine how far S. Luke's Gospel is affected by the Pauline Theology. That task will be attempted later. The present intention is merely to exhibit the significance of the fact that out of the Pauline circle there came—a Gospel.

The occasion on which S. Luke first met S. Paul was not later than S. Paul's first visit to Troas, during what is called his Second Missionary Journey, the visit which is described in Acts xvi. 8. The proof of this statement is as follows.

Certain portions of Acts are written in the first person. The author relates, for instance, that "we sought to go forth into Macedonia" (Acts xvi. 10). These sections abound in personal reminiscence, and are quite evidently the work of an eyewitness of the incidents described. This shews that S. Luke himself was a member of the party at that time. It has indeed been suggested that the author was using a travel-diary of some other person, and that he either neglected or was unwilling to turn from the first person of his authority into the third person of his normal narrative. But this is very unlikely, for various reasons. The theory of carelessness is impossible. S. Luke was too careful a writer to exhibit the seams of his borrowings so crudely. We know that he did use in the Acts material of various kinds.[1] But he used it very skilfully, and it would certainly have occurred

[1] E.g., it is commonly thought that the matter of Acts i. is derived from some *Acta* of the Church in Jerusalem, that chapter viii. came from Philip (with whom S. Paul and S. Luke sojourned at a later date—see Acts xxi. 8, 9, and cf. the incidental mention of Cæsarea in Acts viii. 40) and his daughters. Chapter xii. may well have come from Rhoda, or S. Mark. Other portions of the narrative may be due to the information of, e.g., Aristarchus (see Acts xix. 29, xx. 4, xxvii. 2; also Col. iv. 10, Philem. 24, where in both cases S. Paul mentions him alongside of S. Luke) and Silas. A certain amount is surely from S. Paul himself.

to him in such a case that the abrupt transition was inartistic. He must, therefore, have had some reason for making the transition. There are two possible reasons. Either he desired to pose as the eyewitness, and to pretend that he had been with S. Paul from time to time when, as a matter of fact, he had not been or else he was really an eyewitness at those times. Can we believe that he pretended? It is, I think, a sufficient answer to say that if he had wanted to pretend he would have been clever enough to do it more efficiently. He would have stated roundly that he had been there. It is true that he was a literary artist. But one of the first duties of a literary artist is to use language that will convey his meaning and be understood by those for whom he writes. At the time when he wrote Acts he must have known that the Christians for whom he was writing—or anyhow, the Christians whose sanction he was anxious to obtain—were simple, straightforward people ("babes," Lk. x. 21), who had no taste for subtlety and allusiveness. If he had wanted to produce in their minds for the first time the impression that he had accompanied S. Paul he would have said openly that he had done so.

The alternative theory is that it was his own diary. And this is supported by two important facts. (*a*) The style in which these "we-sections," as they are called, are written is the same as the style of the remainder of the book and of the Gospel. Readers who are not familiar with New Testament criticism may think this a hazardous statement. But it is a solid fact. S. Luke has a definite style of writing, with a great many characteristic words, phrases, and grammatical constructions. The language of the New Testament, especially that of the Gospels and Acts, has been examined with extraordinary minuteness. The researches of Sir John Hawkins and others have put the truth of the statement beyond any kind of doubt.[1] Harnack goes so far as to say, "In no other part of the Acts of the Apostles are the peculiarities of vocabulary and style of the author of the twofold work so accumulated and concentrated as they are in the 'we-sections'" (*Date*

[1] See, for example, Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae* (2nd ed.), pp. 16–25, 26–29, 174–189; Plummer, *Commentary on S. Luke's Gospel*, pp. xli.-lxvii.; Stanton, *Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii, pp. 312–322; Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, pp. 40–87; *Date of the Acts and Synoptic Gospels*, pp. 2–29; Moulton, *Grammar of the New Testament*, i, pp. 13–18.

of Acts, etc., p. 12).[1] And (*b*) no other person known to have been at any time a travel-companion of S. Paul will fill the part. The movements of Timothy, Silas and the others cannot be fitted in with the hypothesis that any one of them was the companion at the times in question. The hypothesis breaks down in every case. With the exception of Titus, for whose authorship there is no other evidence, each one of them can be shewn to have been elsewhere at one or more of the times. Luke "is with me" at them all.

We conclude, then, that S. Luke was a companion of S. Paul during some part of his journeys. Now, the important point is this. The "we-sections" begin at Troas in Acts xvi. 10.[2] That is why it was asserted at the beginning of this chapter that the first acquaintance of S. Paul and S. Luke cannot be later than this stay at Troas. The passage is as follows: "They came down to Troas. And a vision appeared to Paul in the night; there was a man of Macedonia, standing, beseeching him, and saying, Come over into Macedonia, and help us. And when he had seen the vision, straightway we sought to go forth into Macedonia, concluding that God had called us for to preach the Gospel unto them." It shews clearly that S. Luke began to accompany S. Paul at this point. Sir William Ramsay makes (*St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, p. 202) the plausible suggestion that the "man of Macedonia" was S. Luke himself. For otherwise how would S. Paul recognize the man to be a Macedonian? The clothes of a Macedonian would not differ from those of any other Greek. He must have known him before. What more likely than that S. Luke, called in perhaps as a physician, had spoken of the promising field in Philippi and other cities of what we now call Europe, and that S. Paul, falling asleep with the conversation in his mind, had dreamed about his friend? It may even be that Philippi, whose title to pre-eminence, as against the rival claims of Salonika, is asserted so emphatically in Acts xvi. 12, was S. Luke's own city. The early Christians were bolder than some of us to-day. Following the example of their Master,[3] they

[1] Hawkins speaks of "an immense balance of internal and linguistic evidence in favour of the view that the original writer of these sections was the same person as the main author of the Acts and the third Gospel" (*Horae Synopticae*, p. 188).

[2] See note at end of this chapter.

[3] Lk. iv. 16; cp. viii. 38, 39.

did not mind beginning to preach in places where they were known. Anyhow, the description of events at Philippi shews that S. Luke was left behind there. He did not share in the imprisonment of Paul and Silas (the " we " ceases at verse 17), and he probably remained to build up the newly founded Church.

If we could ascertain what period of his development S. Paul had then reached, we should be greatly assisted in determining the standpoint which S. Luke would be likely to acquire. It is important, therefore, to examine the relations that must have subsisted between them.

The things which would most impress the physician in the enthusiastic conversation of the friend, who was so bad a patient, so lovable a man, were :

(1) The importance he attached to the fellowship of the brethren.

(2) His reference of the presence of the Spirit underlying the fellowship to an earlier series of historical events (see chap. iii).

To these may be added :

(3) An expectation, which S. Luke, as a Greek, would not find so congenial, of a coming Day of God (see chap. iv).

Let us consider these three points.

(1) S. Paul's doctrine of the Church.

His doctrine at a later period is clearly set forth in the general or encyclical letter which we call the Epistle to the Ephesians. In that letter no language is too exalted to express his conception of the Body of Christ. He speaks of it as he speaks of Christ Himself. Of Christ he says that God " raised him from the dead " and " seated him at his own right hand " " in the heavenly sphere " (i. 20). Of the Church he says : " When we were dead in trespasses he quickened us with Christ " and " seated us in the heavenly sphere in Christ Jesus " (ii. 5, 6). The glory of the Church is, of course, derivative. The order is—Christ first, then the Church ; " Christ the firstfruits, afterward they that are Christ's." But except that the expression " at his own right hand " is reserved for Christ only, and that the word " quickened " is used only of the Church, the language is identical. There is no doubt that he regarded the Church, which he describes as the Body of Christ, as the earthly expression of the heavenly life of

Christ. He would have had no difficulty in admitting, if the definition had been proposed to him, that the Vicar of Christ, the Representative, Mediator, Revealer and Dispenser of Christ was, theologically, the Holy Spirit, and, practically, the Church. He even goes so far as to say that the Church, Christ's Body, is "the fulfilment of him who is (thereby) completely fulfilled."[1] This means, in theological language, that the Church is the normal "extension of the Incarnation," and that, as more and more souls, of different races and generations and temperaments, are brought into the Church, the perfect Christ is more and more built up.[2] The same idea occurs in Col. i. 24, "I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and *fill up on my part* (ἀνταναπληρῶ) that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh *for his body's sake, which is the Church*."[3] It underlies the thought of Lk. x. 16 ("Whoso heareth you, heareth me"); it underlies the famous "Inasmuch" passage in Mt. xxv. 40 and 45, and also the common expression, "taking up the cross" (cp. Lk. ix. 23, xiv. 27), which must surely mean taking up not merely *another* cross, *like* that of Christ, but having the Christ-member's privilege of taking up part of His Cross. It perhaps also supplies a deeper meaning in the reference to bearing the "stigmata" of Jesus in Gal. vi. 17, and (less certainly) to 2 Cor. iv. 10—"always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus." I have often thought that S. Paul's doctrine of the identification—the term is not too strong, if it be remembered that the Church on its human side is only capable of gradual identification, and at any given time has only arrived at an approximation to complete identity—the identification of Christ and the Church,[4] dates from his own conversion. "Why persecutest thou *Me*?" The "Me" really contains the whole Pauline theology of the Church. At any rate, S. Paul's doctrine

[1] Eph. i. 23. The English Version has an unfortunate mistranslation: "the ulness of him that *filleth* all in all." It treats the word πληρουμένου as a middle. in the sense of "fill" or "pervade." This is possible, but very improbable. The best modern commentators agree that it must be passive. See Robinson, Westcott, *ad loc.*

[2] This is the real answer to the demand of Mr. Wells for "a finite God."

[3] Dr. H. J. C. Knight finds the same thought in the peculiar use of the word "bodily" in Col. ii. 9. See his instructive note in *Colossians* (*The Churchman's Bible*), p. 148 f., and cf. Robinson, *Ephesians*, p. 88.

[4] With reference to the term "identification," a very instructive correspondence between Dr. Sanday and the late Dr. Moberly is printed in Sanday's *Conception of Priesthood*, pp. 131–176. Cp. *Atonement and Personality*, p. 53 and *passim*, and Essays VI and VII in *Foundations*.

of the Church being what it was, it is not surprising to find him saying in Eph. iii. 10, that it was the divine purpose " that there might be made known to the principalities and powers in the heavenly sphere *through the Church* the manifold wisdom of God." The Church is the organ of the divine Operation.

This is high doctrine. And it is commonly asserted that it belongs only to a comparatively late stage of the Pauline development. It is argued that S. Paul only reached his full conception of the Church when he became a prisoner in the imperial city, the centre of the world. His arrival in Rome, the long expected and much desired goal of his journeyings, is thought to have presented to his mind the idea of the Catholic Church, which, founded on a more enduring basis than even the most glorious of earthly empires, was destined to build up on the imperial framework its own spiritual fabric, to utilize and eventually to succeed and supersede the Empire. It cannot be doubted that thoughts of this kind would be confirmed and reinforced by residence, even as a prisoner, at the heart of the Roman world. They would also be developed in the process of compiling, in Ephesians, what was something like a formal treatise on the subject of the Church. But that they were not suggested for the first time at this late period of the Apostle's life is not difficult to prove.

The idea which underlay S. Paul's earlier, controversial Epistles, Galatians and Romans, is essentially the same as that which underlies Ephesians, namely, the Church.[1] For consider what the early controversy was. It was, in substance, this. Is there to be one Church for the Jews, and another for the Gentiles ? That would undoubtedly have been the easiest solution of a grave difficulty. But it was a solution which S. Paul absolutely refused to entertain. In other words, his feeling about the Church already was what he only definitely expounds in a later Epistle. The idea was quite certainly developed in the dozen years or so that elapsed between Galatians and Ephesians, but it was not born.

Now, at the time of the Troas visit (Acts xvi. 8), where the " we-sections," and, consequently, the companionship of S. Luke, begin, S. Paul was in the thick of this controversy. The Council

[1] See Hort, *Romans and Ephesians*, pp. 40, 49, 128, 173

of Jerusalem (Acts xv.) which resulted in a victory for the Pauline party, who desired the inclusion of the Gentile believers in the one Church,[1] was just over. The Epistle to the Galatians, which is vehemently controversial, had been written, according to some authorities, a few months before. And in any case, even if it was somewhat later than this (e.g. at Acts xviii. 23 or xix. 10), much of the material for it, and therefore also of Romans, was seething in the Apostle's mind. The quite recent necessity for controversy on the subject is clearly indicated in Acts xv. 1. S. Luke would be likely to imbibe, during his catechumenate and his subsequent companionship with S. Paul, some elements of the Pauline doctrine of the Church. It would be foolish indeed to assert that he grasped it all, for it is quite obvious that neither he nor any early Christian—it might perhaps be added, nor any Christian of all time—has succeeded in doing that. But enough has been said to make it clear that S. Luke's Gospel emerged from a Pauline environment. The further significance of this fact will be considered in the following chapter.

NOTE ON THE "WE-SECTIONS" AND S. LUKE

The sections in question are Acts xvi. 10–17, xx. 5–16, xxi. 1–18, xxvii. 1–xxviii. 16. They shew that the author went from Troas to Philippi, was left behind there for some years, was picked up again in xx. 5, and accompanied the Apostle to Cæsarea and Jerusalem (xxi. 16, 17) and on his voyage from Cæsarea to Rome. It is, therefore, natural to find him named in the Epistles of the Roman Captivity (Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24). It may be that the unnamed brother, "whose praise is in the Gospel through all the Churches" (2 Cor. viii. 18) is S. Luke, though the expression used quite certainly does not mean the writer of a Gospel. And it is an attractive conjecture that S. Luke is the "true yokefellow" of Phil. iv. 3. He is not mentioned in that Epistle as being with the Apostle. It ought to be added that according to one reading an isolated "we" occurs in Acts xi. 28 at Antioch. This would, perhaps, make it appear that S. Luke belonged not to Philippi, but to Antioch (see p. 20). The theory of Blass that the "Western" readings in Acts, of which xi. 28 is one, are from a first edition of the book, while the ordinary text is a later revised form addressed to Theophilus, has met with some but by no means universal acceptance. "Blass has assigned far too great weight to the readings of this important Codex D with its satellites" (Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, p. xv.). For Blass's converse theory about the text of the Gospel, see p. 231.

[1] According to a well-known and widely accepted "Western" variant reading in Acts xv. 20 and 29, and also xxi. 25, the victory of the Pauline party was much more complete than is suggested by the traditional text. The "Western" texts omit "things strangled" in all three passages. It then becomes easy to interpret the remaining prohibitions as relating to idolatry in general (i.e. not only the eating of idol-meats), fornication, and *murder*. In other words, the Gentiles were simply required to observe the ordinary moral laws of Christian living, and there were no food restrictions at all. The question is discussed at length in K. Lake, *Earlier Epistles of S. Paul*, pp. 48 ff.

Against the supposition that S. Luke was by origin a Philippian are: (*a*) an early tradition (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, iii, 4, 6) that he was "by birth of those from Antioch" (to which may be added the Latin Prologue quoted at the beginning of this volume); (*b*) the way in which Acts emphasizes the importance of Antioch in the history and development of the Church—see, for example, vi. 5 (Nicolas), xi. 19–30 (esp. vv. 20 and 26), xiii. 1, xiv. 26, xv. 2, 23, 35, xviii. 22: Antioch is the starting-point of the mission to the Greek world; (*c*) the possibility that the variant reading in Acts xi. 28 (see above) is correct. The two views may perhaps be combined by supposing that he was an Antiochene who was in medical practice at Philippi. In any case he probably supported himself by professional practice there during the period between Acts xvi. 17 and xx. 5. Miss F. M. Stawell (in a paper on *S. Luke and Virgil*, read at the International Medical Congress at Oxford in 1913, for knowledge of which I am indebted to Dr. Maurice Jones (*New Testament in the Twentieth Century*), has put forward the interesting theory that S. Luke was a Roman, connected with the *gens Annaea*, to which Gallio and Seneca belonged. The evidence for the theory is not at all conclusive, but its acceptance would explain a number of the phenomena of Acts. Sir W. M. Ramsay (*Recent Research*, etc., pp. 370 f.) argues that *Loukas* is the same as *Lucius*. If this was his *praenomen*, he must have been a Roman citizen, and was probably a freedman. On the other hand, he may have been a Hellene with the simple name *Louktos*. In that case he was certainly not a Roman citizen.

Prof. Souter has "little doubt that the reason why Titus, though a valued coadjutor of S. Paul, is not mentioned in Acts is that he was Luke's brother, especially as the only natural way to take the words τὸν ἀδελφόν in 2 Cor. xii. 18 is as 'his brother,' i.e. the brother of the man previously mentioned, that is, of Titus" (*Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*, ii, 84; cp., for a fuller treatment of the theory, *Expos. Times*, xviii, pp. 285, 325).

CHAPTER III

PENTECOST AND GALILEE

It was said in the last chapter that the first thing by which the physician would be impressed in the teaching of his friend would be the importance which he attached to the fellowship of believers, that is, the Church. The second thing was the reference of the presence of the Spirit underlying this fellowship to an earlier series of historical events. In this connexion let it be remembered that S. Luke, as was said before, wrote the whole of his Gospel with his mind full of the great event which he records in the second chapter of his other book. For the all-important link in the chain of backward reference was the Day of Pentecost. The physician, as an educated man, with at least something of the historical mind, would inquire how and when the immanence of the Spirit in the community had begun. He would learn that it was at a certain popular religious festival, to wit, a Harvest Thanksgiving, at which the Almighty had revealed Himself, after His manner, as One Who consecrates common things. It was impossible to analyse the Christian fellowship, as it existed, without perceiving that it had been created and was maintained by a certain indwelling Spirit. And it appeared that it was at Pentecost that this Spirit had come upon the disciples and had made them into the Church.[1]

The Spirit is mentioned in the Lukan writings under various names: "The Holy Spirit" (with, or without, the article), "the

[1] It is sometimes thought that S. Luke's account of the events of the Day of Pentecost is unhistorical. The view appears to depend on an exaggerated estimate of the difference between the Pauline view of "speaking with tongues" and the view taken in Acts ii. But even if it be supposed that Acts ii. is only a picturesque attempt to ascribe a fitting origin to certain existing phenomena, the argument of this chapter remains practically unaffected. That the early Christians were full of some unusual and mysterious spiritual influence is perhaps the most certain fact in early Christian history. There must have been some event, or events, which marked the beginning of this known condition.

Spirit," "the Spirit of the Lord," and, once, in a remarkable passage (Acts xvi. 7), "the Spirit of Jesus." S. Paul in some places appears to speak of Christ and the Spirit almost indifferently. So much so, in fact, that Deissmann, a modern and enthusiastic interpreter of S. Paul, says bluntly, following Pfleiderer and others, that he identifies the two conceptions.[1] This is clearly an exaggeration, as may be seen from passages like 2 Cor. xiii. 14—"The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost"; Eph. ii. 18—"through him (Christ) we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father"; Eph. iii. 16—"strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith"; or the series in Eph. iv. 4–6—"There is one body . . . one Spirit . . . one Lord . . . one God and Father of all." But the point is this: when S. Paul spoke of Christ he did mean in the first instance the spiritual power and presence of the heavenly Christ,[2] and this was due to the nature, and date, of his conversion. He did not mean primarily the Jesus Who walked in Galilee. That, in his thought, came after. He went back to that from Pentecost. But to what extent was it vital? What, in other words, was the Pauline, and therefore to a considerable extent the Lukan, analysis of that spiritual presence? The

[1] "The living Christ is the Spirit." "In numerous passages S. Paul makes statements about Christ and the Spirit in precisely equivalent terms. This is specially observable in the parallelism of the mystical formulæ 'in Christ' and 'in the Holy Spirit'" (*S. Paul, a Study in Social and Religious History*, Eng. tr., pp. 125 ff.). Passages which lend a certain amount of support to this position are Rom. viii. 9–11, 1 Cor. ii. 10–16, xv. 45, and perhaps above all (especially if κύριον be read in *v.* 17) 2 Cor. iii. 14–18.

[2] "If you have ever imagined a young Rabbi or a Galilean artisan who, by his exquisite goodness and purity, his realization of the brotherhood of man, his consciousness of the fatherhood of God, made so deep an impression upon his friends that after his condemnation and death they thought of him as living with divine power, and pouring a divine radiance into their own lives—if you add to this that he did actually rise from the grave by the power of God and appeared to these friends, assuring them of his endless life—if you suppose that you have thus rendered a reasonable historical account of the Gospel, you have to reckon with the fact that S. Paul himself, our chief witness of the events, knew no such legend. For him it was no Jewish Rabbi or Galilean peasant who died and rose again: it was the Son of God, who humbled himself to be made in the likeness of men, expressly that he might die and triumph" (T. A. Lacey, *The Historic Christ*, p. 33).

A good example of the way in which S. Paul, at the mention of Christ, begins at once to "theologize" is 2 Cor. i. 17–20. His defence of himself from the charge of fickleness leads to a mention of the truthfulness of Christ, and He, says S. Paul, is the Everlasting Yea, because the Incarnation is the fulfilment of all the promises of God.

question raises a problem of some difficulty, for the solution of which S. Luke's writings supply much of the material.[1]

We must first ask a preliminary question. What exactly is meant by saying that Christianity is an historical religion? It means, I suppose, that it depends for its validity upon the fact, or at the very least upon the assumption, that certain events in what is known as the past really happened. But, on the other hand, is it not true, as Dr. Figgis is always saying, that it is right to begin history *at this end*? There is, he declares, only one fixed date in history, and that is now. Such, I am persuaded, was S. Paul's position. He began with the only thing he really knew. He said, "Here am I, a man whose heart Christ has touched. He has drawn me into the company of those who are His, He has made me a member of His Body." But the thinker instantly works backwards.[2] He was much too practical—not to speak of the fact that he was a Pharisee, with Jerusalem connexions, who had doubtless known and probably approved of what had been done outside the city on that famous Friday afternoon—but at any rate he was much too practical to accept any religion which would appear to him to be standing in the air. He would say at once, "Who is this Christ?" And the answer would be, as in fact the answer was, "It is Jesus." "It is He Who was crucified. It is He of Whose suppression I heard and approved. It is He of Whom Stephen spoke.[3] It is He Whom I had supposed to be a disloyal and undesirable schismatic. It is He Who lived in Galilee." That, or something like that, is surely what happened. The suggestion that S. Paul accepted Christ without any thought of Who He was or what He had done is impossible. For the supreme obstacle which S. Paul had to surmount on his conversion was the fact of the Crucifixion. This, as he says, was "to Jews a stumbling-block." To him, a Pharisee, the son of Pharisees, a fierce patriot and defender of the traditions of his fathers, it must

[1] It is impossible here to do more than allude to the profound significance of the fact that the Fourth Gospel, in the later chapters of which the Spirit is "Christ's *Alter Ego*" (B. T. D. Smith, *The Parting of the Roads*, p. 279), is presented in the form not of a theological treatise, *but of a Gospel*.

[2] As indeed Peter and the other Apostles did in *their* preaching. The first thing that they proclaimed in Jerusalem was the fact of the Resurrection; the thought of Acts x. 38 ("Who went about doing good") comes later.

[3] It is not unlikely that Saul was among those of the Synagogue "of them of Cilicia" who disputed (Acts vi. 9) with Stephen.

have been a stumbling-block of peculiar difficulty. There is not the least doubt that he found a way not round it but over it. He made what might have been an occasion of falling into the means of his wealth.[1] He claimed the offence itself as the ground of his faith and hope. "We preach Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumbling-block, and unto Gentiles foolishness; but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ, divine power and Christ, divine wisdom. Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men" (1 Cor. i. 23–25). And the fact of the Crucifixion carries with it the fact of an earthly life. Calvary brings with it Galilee.

Those writers of the "Mythological" school,[2] who attempt to shake the received belief in the historical existence of Jesus of Nazareth, find their greatest difficulty in the evidence of S. Paul, and the opposition of the Jews to him. To explain the former, they have recourse to wholesale excisions from the text of his Epistles, a procedure for which there is no authority either in the manuscripts or in the principles of scientific historical investigation. And one favourite method of disparaging—not necessarily the historical existence of Our Lord, but S. Paul's concern with it—is to assert that Christianity was to S. Paul only the best of the contemporary mystery-religions.

The mystery-religions are an exceedingly interesting phenomenon of the first few Christian centuries. The one about which we have most information, namely, Mithraism, is post-Pauline. It did not become popular till the second and third centuries, when it was for a time a very serious rival of Christianity. But some of them existed in S. Paul's time. They came from Egypt or Phrygia, or from the heart of Asia. They were founded in many cases on the annual resurrection of Nature which takes place in the spring, and they personified this into the death and resurrection of a deity, whom no one really supposed to be an historical character. He was merely a convenient symbol. They were regular religions, with priests, temples, liturgies, rituals, and a doctrine of salvation and eternal life.[3] They did not make very

[1] See, for example, his treatment (in Gal. iii. 10–14) of Deut. xxi. 23: "He that is hanged is accursed of God."

[2] See note at the end of this chapter (p. 32).

[3] E.g. it has often been noticed that the language of the girl with the spirit of divination in Acts xvi. 17 is reminiscent of the Mystery-terminology.

much difference to the moral character of their adherents, but they provided an attractive outlet for religious emotion. Apart from the Jews, who would not touch them, they influenced a large number of the more religious inhabitants of the Greek cities in S. Paul's time. It has been suggested by no less a person than Loisy [1] that Pauline Christianity was simply a mystery-cult, and that S. Paul cared no more, and perhaps believed no more, about the historicity of Jesus than the Osiris-worshipper cared or believed about the historical existence of Osiris.

In the face of this resolution, whether of the Pauline conception or of Christianity itself, into a mythology, we are entitled to ask "What are the facts?" Did S. Paul, at his conversion, or before, or after, engage for his own satisfaction in any kind of historical research? And if so, how thoroughly did he (and, we may add, S. Luke) carry through the process?

The first impression of the ordinary person who is not familiar with the New Testament is that, of course, S. Paul had read the Gospels, especially perhaps the Gospel of S. Luke, just like anybody else. But he soon finds that this is impossible. He comes across some book like Mr. Lacey's *The Historic Christ*, or perhaps he conducts some independent study of S. Paul, and he is surprised to find that S. Paul makes so little mention of Our Lord's earthly life. He finds that there is something to be said for the position that S. Paul knew very little and cared hardly at all about the historical events.[2] He perhaps is puzzled by some such verse as 2 Cor. v. 16: "Wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh: even though we have known Christ after

[1] The later, more fantastic Loisy, not Loisy the grave critic, and not, if I may say so, Loisy the Christian priest. See *Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1911, p. 45 f.: "Paul having translated the Passion of Jesus into a myth of salvation, the Christ of history had no place at all in his religion" (p. 61). It is true that Loisy does not go all the way with the thoroughgoing mythologists. See l.c. p. 63.

[2] E.g. Dr. P. Gardner says: "As to the journeyings and public ministry of his Master, Paul knew very little, probably less than a sceptical modern critic would regard as reasonably certain" (*Religious Experience of St. Paul*, p. 252). But Harnack writes (*Date of Acts*, etc., p. 117): "The book [Acts] suggests the question: Did Jesus really live at all? . . . So people would have probably judged; for they now say much the same in the case of S. Paul. Fortunately, the author of Acts has also written a 'gospel,' and accordingly the whole of this train of argument is upset. Unfortunately, we possess no 'gospel' from the hand of S. Paul; but no one can be sure that, if he had written one, it would have been poorer in subject-matter than that of S. Luke." The whole question is very fully discussed in Knowling's *Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*.

the flesh, yet now we know him so no more," [1] and he comes to the hasty and erroneous conclusion that S. Paul's was a non-historical religion.

Continued study would, I think, lead our inquirer to a conclusion less crude and sweeping. I can only give a brief account of the problem.

(*a*) In general.

It is certain that S. Paul was a great believer in the doctrine of the Incarnation. There is no need to quote a long series of passages. Any one who has ever read S. Paul will know that the great Christological passage of Phil. ii. 6 f.: "Who, being in the form of God . . . emptied himself, taking the form of a servant," is only an epitome of his whole teaching. He insists on every page on exactly those fundamental elements of Christian belief about Our Lord—"came," "suffered," "rose," "ascended"—which are mentioned in the Apostles' Creed. They constitute what he describes in 1 Cor. xv. 1–4 as his "Gospel." S. Paul is, in fact, one of the two great exponents of Christian doctrine in the New Testament. And belief in the Incarnation was the breath of his spiritual life.

But besides being the great believer, he was the great pastor. I find it wholly impossible to suppose that he was not profoundly sensible of the practical, pastoral advantage of being able to appeal to the earthly footprints of the Son of Man. It has been said already that knowledge of the Crucifixion presupposes knowledge of the Ministry. And those who are concerned with work of a pastoral kind know that, whether in public or in private speaking, hearers are always interested if it can be shewn that, as some one once put it, Our Lord was a real person. Thus in 1 Cor. xi. 1 (cf. 1 Thess. i. 6) he says, "Be ye imitators of me, as I am of Christ," though there is no further particularization.

[1] Several recent scholars—e.g. Johannes Weiss (*Paul and Jesus*, Eng. tr.), J. H. Moulton (*Expositor*, July 1911, p. 166), and Sir W. M. Ramsay (*Expositor*, May 1901, p. 362 f., and Oct. 1911, p. 296 f.; see below, p. 146 n.)—interpret the second half of this verse as meaning that S. Paul had actually seen and known Jesus of Nazareth in His earthly lifetime. This is by no means impossible, but it does not follow from the passage. The meaning of the whole verse is that before his conversion he had judged Jesus by what he now sees to have been a worldly and carnal judgment. "It is not a '*Christ* after the flesh,' but a 'knowledge' of Christ 'after the flesh' that is devoid of spiritual value" (*Foundations*, p. 188).

Again, there is no doubt that the reference in 2 Cor. viii. 9 (" who, though he was rich, for your sakes became poor ") is primarily, and almost wholly, to the doctrinal fact of the Incarnation, but it is hard to believe that the choice of the particular word " became poor " does not denote an interested knowledge of the actual circumstances of the life in Galilee.[1] And though the passage in Eph. iv. 20 (" But ye did not so learn Christ, if so be that ye heard him and were taught in him, as the truth is in Jesus ") *may* be interpreted of instruction in what we call the Apostles' Creed, yet it " strongly suggests that systematic instruction in a Christ-like character, by reference to His Teaching as well as His Example, had been given." [2] So also he speaks (1 Tim. vi. 3) of the importance of adhering to " sound words, the words of Our Lord Jesus Christ." [3]

We all know something of what the Gospels have been to the Church. We know, for example, what an essential niche the story of the Cradle at Bethlehem has made for itself in the complete gallery of Christian knowledge. It is the fact that Christendom, which, humanly speaking, has been taught chiefly by S. Paul, has found its favourite Bible-reading in the first two chapters of S. Luke.

S. Paul appealed confidently to the appearance that brought about his conversion. On this he grounded his claim to be an Apostle.[4] He carefully distinguished this historical appearance (together with the other appearances recorded in 1 Cor. xv. 1–11) [5] from the " visions and revelations of the Lord," the mystic communings, which, as he says in 2 Cor. xii. 2–4, it " is not lawful for a man to repeat," on which, therefore, he will ground no kind of claim. It is not, therefore, likely that the man to whom the

[1] Dr. Moulton, commenting on 2 Cor. viii. 2, supposes that Saul had been present during the conversation recorded in Lk. xxi. 1–4 (*Expositor*, July 1911, p. 25).

[2] Stanton, *Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii. p. 65.

[3] *ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις*. It seems not impossible that expressions of this sort, which are characteristic of the Pastoral Epistles (see 1 Tim. i. 10, vi. 3; 2 Tim. i. 13, iv. 3; Tit. i. 9, 13, ii. 1, 2) are due to association with the beloved physician. S. Luke has (v. 31) " they that are whole (*οἱ ὑγιαίνοντες*) " for S. Matthew's *οἱ ἰσχύοντες*.

[4] 1 Cor. ix. 1: " Am I not free? Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus Our Lord? " One of the qualifications for apostleship was ability to be a witness of the Resurrection. See Acts i. 22.

[5] It is true, of course, that the appearance to S. Paul was after the Ascension, whereas the others were before. And S. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 8 distinguishes them on this ground. But elsewhere he observes only the classification indicated in the text.

event of the road to Damascus was everything, would undervalue the importance of that longer and more sacred road that led from Bethlehem to Calvary. "We see no trace in his writings," says Dr. P. Gardner, "of any difficulty in uniting in thought the eternal with the temporal existence." [1]

As for the question whether S. Paul thought of Christianity as one of the mysteries, the actual evidence for the hypothesis is very slight indeed. He is fond of calling the Gospel a *musterion*, and he uses some of the technical mystery-terms, e.g. "enlighten," "seal," "the perfect," i.e. the initiated. The argument of 1 Cor. x. 14–22 is: "What your mysteries profess to do, the Breaking of the Bread really does." He was probably quite glad to use language which his Greek readers, who were familiar with the mysteries and had in many cases been *habitués* of them, would understand. But S. Paul deprecates in the strongest possible way (1 Cor. x. 21) any attempt to *combine* (καί) the old mysteries and the Christian Eucharist, and, as a matter of fact, all his so-called "mystery-words" can be paralleled from Jewish literature. Above all, at the heart of his exposition of the Eucharist—the very place where Hellenism might be expected, and indeed is found—lies the thoroughly eschatological, and therefore Jewish, thought of "till He come." Nothing can really shake the position of those who maintain that Christianity, including Pauline Christianity, is rooted in Judaism. And if Christianity is rooted in Judaism, it is not a "pre-Christian, heathen, mythological cult." [2]

(*b*) In detail.

The references are not many, but they are quite conclusive. S. Paul not only knows the fundamental facts of the Incarnation, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension, but he is familiar with the fact of the Lord's descent from David (Rom. i. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 8),

[1] In his contribution to *Jesus or Christ?*, p. 53.

[2] Dr. Hamilton's *The People of God* is a masterly exposition of the continuity of the Old and New Testaments. Cf. Clemen (*Primitive Christianity and its non-Jewish Sources*, Eng. tr., p. 372): "The New Testament *ideas* that are *perhaps* derived from non-Jewish sources—for we may emphasize once more the hypothetical nature of most of our results—lie mainly on the fringe of Christianity, and do not touch its vital essence." The utmost that can be said of the extent of Mystery-influence on S. Paul is put very attractively by Dr. Percy Gardner in *The Religious Experience of S. Paul*, and by Professor Lake in *The Earlier Epistles of S. Paul*. See also *Foundations*, p. 181 ff.

with the birth from a woman (Gal. iv. 4), with the manner of the death, i.e. by crucifixion upon the Tree, with the fact that the Resurrection took place "on the third day" (1 Cor. xv. 4), and with the names of those to whom the Risen Lord appeared. He speaks of the Twelve, of Cephas and John as the most important of them (Gal. ii. 9), of the wife of Cephas, and of the Lord's Brethren (1 Cor. ix. 5) exactly as in the Gospels. He appeals to the Corinthians (2 Cor. v. 21) by Our Lord's sinless life, and (2 Cor. x. 1) "by the meekness and gentleness of Christ"; the latter phrase perhaps indicates that he was familiar with the saying recorded in Mt. xi. 29 ("I am meek and lowly of heart").[1] He knows not only that Jesus was of the seed of David, but also that He was made (Rom. xv. 8) "a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God." In Rom. xv. 3, he says "even Christ pleased not himself," and in 1 Tim. vi. 13 that "Christ Jesus witnessed before Pontius Pilate the good confession." And there is, of course, the famous description of the Last Supper in 1 Cor. xi., which, be it noted, is only brought in because of certain misunderstandings and misdemeanours which have occurred at Corinth. It is only the necessity for administering a rebuke which shews us how much S. Paul knew of this particular set of historical facts, and how important he believed it to be.

There are also passages which appear to shew acquaintance with the general teaching, or with the actually recorded words, of Jesus. He tells the Thessalonians (1 Th. iv. 15) "by a word of the Lord" that those who survive till the Parousia will have no advantage over those who have died. And in 1 Th. iv. 2 he reminds them of the injunctions that he had previously given them on the subject of personal holiness "through the Lord Jesus." In Gal. iii. 12 (cp. Rom. x. 5) he quotes, albeit with a note of disparagement that is his own, a passage about the Law (Lev. xviii. 5; Ezek. xx. 11) to which Our Lord refers in Lk. x. 28.[2] In his teaching about marriage in 1 Cor. vii. he distinguishes the various degrees of authority which he claims for his judgments (see verses 6, 10, 12, 25, 40), and appeals sometimes to "the Lord." It is conceivable that he is here referring to some private

[1] Cp. also Eph. iv. 1, 2; Col. iii. 12.

[2] It is remarkable that the word "justify," in quite a Pauline sense, occurs in Lk. x. 29 and xvi. 15.

mystical experience of his own, but his judgments do in fact coincide with judgments of Our Lord recorded in the Gospels.[1] 1 Cor. x. 27 (" Eat whatever is set before you ") is identical with Lk. x. 8, though the connexion is different. 1 Th. v. 2 (" the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night ") is like Mt. xxiv. 43; 1 Tim. v. 18 (" the labourer is worthy of his hire ") is identical with Lk. x. 7.[2] With this may be compared 1 Cor. ix. 14: " So did the Lord ordain that they who preach the Gospel shall live of the Gospel." Rom. xii. 14–17 (" bless them that persecute you, bless and curse not . . . not rendering evil for evil ") looks like an echo of Mt. v. 44: " But I say unto you, Love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you; " and Lk. vi. 27, 28: " Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, bless them that curse you," etc. Rom. xii. 21: " Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good," reminds us of Jn. xvi. 33: " I have overcome the world." Rom. xvi. 19: " I would have you to be wise unto that which is good, innocent unto that which is evil," is only another form of Mt. x. 16: " Shew yourselves therefore prudent as serpents, innocent as doves." Finally, in his speech at Miletus to the Ephesian elders, S. Paul quotes (Acts xx. 35) a saying of the Lord Jesus, " that it is more blessed to give than to receive," which is not elsewhere recorded, not even in the Gospel of S. Luke, who was perhaps a hearer of the address. In fact, it is not too much to say, with Dr. Anderson Scott, that " Paul shews just that harmony with Jesus, with His aim and method, which in another we should put down to intimacy. In fact, were it not that we have such excellent reasons for believing that he was not one of the disciples of Jesus, we should inevitably have taken him to be one of these, and the one among them who had entered most deeply into his Master's spirit. Even the most rigidly historical among the critics make large admissions in this direction. Thus Bousset: 'He who had never known Jesus in

[1] See especially v. 10: " Unto the married I give charge, yet not I, but the Lord, that the wife depart not from her husband (but and if she depart [i.e. what we now call a " separation "], let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband); and that the husband leave not his wife." This agrees exactly, even to the use of the word χωρίζειν, with Mk. x. 1–12.

[2] It has occasionally been held that this is an actual appeal to canonical Scripture. If this were so, it would at once put the date of the Epistle into the second century. But " the Scripture " is, of course, the first half of the verse (Deut. xxv. 4), and the καί means " compare also the well-known saying."

person understood Him better than the small souls who appealed to their personal connexion with Him'; Wernle: 'Paul never knew Jesus in his lifetime, and nevertheless it was he who best understood Him'; 'he who would understand S. Paul aright, should seek to find him at the height of his ideal, and then he will discover that he is not far distant from Jesus'; Jülicher: 'It is not a poor repetition of words that is to be ascribed to the great Apostle: what was controlling for him was the total impression made by the historical Christ'" (*Cambridge Biblical Essays*, pp. 375–376).

There is ample evidence to shew that he was familiar with what we may call the traditional portrait. It is reasonably certain that he had known something of the facts while he was still a persecutor, that he learned a good deal more from Ananias at his Baptism, much more again during the fifteen days spent at Jerusalem in conference with Peter (Gal. i. 18) some years later, and that he used his opportunities when lodging with Philip the Evangelist and with Mnason, the "original disciple," at a still later period (Acts xxi. 8, 16). On the last two occasions S. Luke was with him. The inference that he was either ignorant or indifferent about certain things which he does not mention is highly precarious. It would not be impossible to find thirteen modern sermons in which less is said about the events of our Lord's Ministry. I am not sure that in the circumstances of the present day they would be good sermons or worthy to be preached. But they would not be impossible to find. It must be remembered that the congregation or congregations to whom the Pauline Epistle-sermons are addressed are persons without a New Testament, with probably no single copy of any one Gospel in their hands, and also persons whose original instruction was by oral catechizing; and further, if it be borne in mind that the lections read in the services of these congregations provided no means of verifying possible Galilee-allusions, but were either from the Old Testament or from some Christian writings of an epistolary nature, the comparative absence of reference to the incidents of what we call the Gospels becomes much less astonishing.

Lastly, it is notorious that S. Paul was suspect to a certain number of his fellow-Christians. From the controversial, auto-

biographical nature of his writings we happen to know a good deal of the ground of these suspicions. It seems he was actually suspected because he had not been a disciple of Jesus of Nazareth in the flesh, because he was a slow late-learner in the school of Christ. When we remember this, and when we remember that his first, dominating thought of Christ *was* the thought of Christ *now*, Christ reigning in the heavens, is it not significant that the man, who was so much suspected, and suspected moreover on the very ground that he had not had the experience of personal association, a man, too, who was really open to the charge—if charge it were—of approaching his religion from the mystical rather than from the historical side, was never, so far as we know, accused of disparaging the Galilean Ministry? The very men who had known Jesus in the flesh, who had seen and heard Him, and with their hands had handled Him, were content to find themselves members of a mystical communion, which S. Paul expounded to them as the Body of Christ. They were neither distressed nor puzzled by the Pauline doctrine of the Church.

(*c*) Finally, there is S. Luke. The man who travelled with S. Paul and made him the hero of a book, who is clearly and deeply influenced by him, whose thought and language alike are noticeably Pauline, is induced—we do not know by what, but it is unlikely to have been wholly against his masterful friend's own judgment and approval—to make a contribution to the possessions of the Church. That contribution, the contribution of S. Luke, the friend and disciple of S. Paul, took the form of a written Gospel.

NOTE ON THE CHRIST-MYTH THEORY

It is remarkable that while some of the writers in question, e.g. Mr. J. M. Robertson, are definitely anti-Christian, others see in the reduction of the historicity of Jesus either to a negligible quantity or to a myth the surest bulwark of a new, impregnable "Christianity." Among these are Drews (in Germany), W. B. Smith (in America), and K. C. Anderson. It is not necessary in this book to deal in any detail with the fantastic arguments of this school, but it may be noted that there is an increasing tendency among recent scholars to regard as at least partly genuine the famous reference to Jesus in Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 3, 3), which had long been suspected, though not by Renan (*Vie de Jésus*, ed. 1863, p. x.), to be a Christian interpolation. See Burkitt in *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1913, pp. 135–144; Harnack in *Internat. Monatsschrift für Wiss.*, 1913, pp. 1037–1068; J. Weiss, *Jesus von Nazareth*, p. 88, n. 1. Another passage (*Ant.*

xx. 9, 1) about the death of James, "the brother of Jesus, who was called Christ," is less suspected. The former passage, if any part of it is genuine, is fatal to the myth-theory. So are the well-known references in Tacitus (*Ann.* xv. 44) and Suetonius (*Claudius*, 45). And so are many other things, including even a very slight capacity to estimate the connexion between effects and causes. A scathing exposure of the Christ-myth theory, mingled with a good deal that is distasteful to Christian readers, will be found in F. C. Conybeare, *The Historical Christ*.

Whateley's famous *Historic Doubts concerning Napoleon Buonaparte* shews how easy it is to make out a case for the non-existence of an historical person. In the same spirit of ingenious irony Henry Rogers, *The Eclipse of Faith*, sets forth (pp. 296 f.) the obviously mythological character of the "Papal Aggression" of 1850.

The nine "foundation-pillars for a truly scientific life of Jesus," according to Prof. Schmiedel (*Encycl. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 1881–1883), are: Mk. iii. 21 ("he is beside himself"); Mk. vi. 5 ("he could there do no mighty work"); Mk. viii. 12 (cp. Mt. xii. 39, xvi. 4; Lk. xi. 29) ("there shall no sign be given"); Mk. x. 18 = Lk. xviii. 19 ("Why callest thou me good?"); Mk. xiii. 32 = Mt. xxiv. 36 ("none knoweth—not even the Son"); Mk. xv. 34 = Mt. xxvii. 46 ("Why hast thou forsaken me?"); and Mt. xii. 32 = Lk. xii. 10 (blasphemy against the Son of Man may be forgiven); also Mk. viii. 14–21 (if it be conceded that the feeding of the 4000 and of the 5000 are really parables referring to spiritual food) and Mt. xi. 5 = Lk. vii. 22 (if we suppose that the healings and raisings are spiritual). This judgment, which is often quoted, is sometimes misunderstood. Schmiedel is arguing against the Mythic School, and the reason why those nine passages are "pillars" is that they are such as would in no case have been invented. Whatever tendencies there were in the early Church were in the opposite direction. "If passages of this kind were wholly wanting in them it would be impossible to prove to a sceptic that any historical value was to be assigned to the Gospels; he would be in a position to declare the picture of Jesus contained in them to be purely a work of phantasy, and could remove the person of Jesus from the field of history" (*Encycl. Bibl.*, ii. 1881). Schmiedel really maintains that they "form the ground-plan of what is credible, and that when once the existence of Jesus has been proved by their means, then everything in the first three Gospels which agrees with the image of Jesus as founded on the "Pillars," and does not lie otherwise open to objection, is worthy of belief" (*Jesus or Christ?*, p. 80: cp. his Preface to Arno Neumann's *Jesus*, Eng. tr.).

Thus, for example, it is "wholly credible" that the name Cephas was bestowed upon Simon by Jesus. We can "recognize faithful reminiscence in the statement that in Gethsemane Jesus took Peter, James, and John to watch with him, and that nevertheless they fell asleep," and that in the case of the raising of Jairus's daughter the same three were chosen witnesses. "There is no difficulty in believing that Jesus on a sabbath-day healed Peter's mother-in-law and other sick persons, but on the following day withdrew himself into solitude and was sought out by Peter and his comrades" (*Encycl. Bibl.*, iv. 4572). In fact, the power of healing (where there is faith) "is so strongly attested throughout the first and second centuries that in view of the spiritual greatness of Jesus, the imposing character of his personality, it would be indeed difficult to deny it to him" (*Encycl. Bibl.*, ii. 1884). "Appearances of the risen Jesus did actually occur; that is to say, the followers of Jesus really had the impression of having seen him" (*Encycl. Bibl.*, iv. 4061). But the real province of the credible and the real centre of interest he characteristically finds (ii. 1889) in "the purely religious-ethical utterances of Jesus." "Here we have a wide field of the wholly credible in which to expatiate, and it would be of unmixed advantage for theology were it to concentrate its strength upon the examination of these sayings, and not attach so much importance to the minute investigation of the other less important details of the gospel history."

CHAPTER IV

THE APOCALYPTIC BACKGROUND

It was said above that the third thing which would impress the physician in the teaching of his friend was likely to be less congenial to the Greek than it was to the Jew. It was the expectation of a Coming Day of God.

That the expectation of the Parousia was a very large element in S. Paul's outlook needs no proving. It is true that his Epistles are constantly dealing with moral topics quite apart from eschatology, and that in the matter of eschatology, as time went on, he gradually spiritualized the hope, while from the first he balanced it by other elements.[1] But no one will deny that it is there. "There is probably no dispute," writes Professor Lake, "among students of the New Testament . . . that this belief is found in the Pauline Epistles; the point which is seriously disputed is whether it is central or peripheral. That it was absolutely central to the average Gentile Christian in, for instance, Corinth, I do not believe; for the centre of Christianity for him was the Sacraments rather than the expectation of the Parousia, even though the latter was a very prominent part of his creed.[2] On the other hand, for a Jewish Christian, the expectation of the Parousia was probably quite central. I believe that it was so for S. Paul himself, and the reason why there is comparatively so little in the Epistles on the subject is because it was not a subject for contro-

[1] Thus Romans xiv. 17 (cf. viii. 14, 15; 1 Cor. iv. 20) is a definition of the "kingdom" in terms of the present. In fact it is often said that δικαιοσύνη is S. Paul's substitute for the "kingdom" of the Gospels. And from the first he uses his favourite formula "in Christ" in a present sense. But, on the other hand, even this was only an "earnest" (Rom. viii. 23) of that which was to come. Cp. Eph. i. 13, 14.

[2] There seems little doubt that the four points mentioned in 1 Thess. i. 9, 10—(1) turning from idols to God, (2) awaiting His Son from heaven, (3) Whom He raised from the dead, (4) Who delivereth us from the wrath to come—form a characteristic summary of S. Paul's early preaching to the Gentiles. The Sacraments would come in as the way in which all four are realized and carried into practical effect.

versy among Christians, but an undisputed hope which all cherished." [1] This is perhaps an overstatement, and anyhow is difficult to prove. But no student of S. Paul can meet it with a flat denial. It may therefore be taken for granted that S. Luke, in the process of forming his own theological opinions, was compelled to take into consideration the existence of a large Apocalyptic element in the Christianity which was presented to him. I attempt later to indicate the way in which he dealt with it.[2] But meantime we must consider two things. Where did Apocalyptic come from, and what sort of sanction had the Lord Himself given to it ?

The expectation of a Coming Age, introduced by a Day of the Lord, had come to the Jews of our Lord's time from the Old Testament, but its form had been much affected by the religious literature produced by Judaism between the end of the Old Testament and the Birth of Christ.[3] This literature is largely of what is called an apocalyptic character, that is, it more or less resembles the Book of Daniel [4] and the Revelation of S. John. It was widely read by our Lord's contemporaries, and there is no doubt that He was Himself familiar with a good deal of it. His words, as recorded in the Gospels, contain many allusions to it, and some direct quotations.

The Book of Daniel was written at the beginning of the Maccabean period, about 166 B.C., during the terrible persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. Its object, as the object of Apocalyptic writing always is, was to reassure the distressed faithful by

[1] *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 437. Mr. Emmet, however, writes: "Surely no one can maintain that the eschatological idea was with him [S. Paul] central and all-pervading. It never, so far as we can see, affected his practical policy, which was to spread the kingdom of God, or the Church, upon earth here and now, as a new power in the midst of existing society; it but seldom affected his ethical teaching. . . . What has the thought of an immediate Parousia to do with his view of the Atonement or justification, his Christology, or later doctrine of the Church ?" (*The Eschatological Question in the Gospels*, p. 59, a most valuable and illuminating book).

[2] In outline at the end of this chapter; in rather more detail in chapter vii.

[3] See R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* (translation and commentary); W. E. Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha, their Origin, Teaching and Contents*; F. C. Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. There is a convenient series of translations, edited by Dr. Oesterley and Canon Box, of (*a*) Palestinian-Jewish and (*b*) Hellenistic-Jewish Texts, published by S.P.C.K. A clear account of the more important books is given in Latimer Jackson, *Eschatology of Jesus*, pp. 171–254.

[4] Isaiah xxiv.–xxvii. is also an Apocalypse, and Joel, Zechariah ix.–xiv., and much of Ezekiel are of an Apocalyptic character.

reminding them that their cause is in the hands of God, Who will work out His purpose in his own way and at His own time. The hero of the book is a character from an earlier period of Jewish history, the Babylonian Captivity, a period less violent than the time of writing, but difficult and depressing. The purpose of this choice is to shew that the Almighty has guided His chosen through dangerous events before; that He Who has saved will save again. In much the same way other Apocalyptic writers take Enoch, Moses, or Elijah as their hero.

The main lesson of Prophecy is "let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." The motto of the Apocalyptists, on the other hand, is "look up, ye fearful saints." In accordance with this idea, the Apocalyptic writings have much more to say about the life after death than the Old Testament. Even Dan. xii. 2 ff., which speaks only of a partial resurrection, is perhaps the most definite Old Testament utterance on the subject of immortality, and the later Apocalyptic Books and the Apocrypha generally represent a further advance.

The main subject of Apocalyptic writing, as well as of the more futurist parts of the Old Testament, is the Coming Age, which in the Gospels is more particularly defined as the "Kingdom" or "Reign" of God.[1] The time is coming when God will at last reveal Himself with power, will judge the nations and (in some writings, e.g. Amos and Hosea) Israel too, and will vindicate before all the world the claim of a regenerated Israel to be His People. This Messianic dispensation is the one constant element in the expectation of the Jews. It appears sometimes without any mention of a personal Messiah, and, where Messiah is spoken of, he is sometimes not much more than a representative of the people. Thus, in the Book of Enoch in chapters i–xxxvi and xci–civ there is no Messiah, and in lxxxiii–xc (165–161 B.C.) the Messiah is merely "the head of the Messianic community out

[1] "The Kingdom of God" is not found in the Old Testament (Wisd. x. 10 is in a different sense) nor is its synonym "the Kingdom of Heaven," though the general idea of a theocracy already existing and some day to be perfectly established is abundant. In the Apocalyptic books "the Kingdom of God" is found in a few passages only. Dr. E. F. Scott suggests (*The Kingdom and the Messiah*, p. 93) that "the idea of a kingdom, with its suggestion of a restored Israel, was never superseded by the more vague and speculative idea. Its re-emergence in the later Rabbinical literature can best be explained from its thus surviving among the people; and in the same manner we may account for its use by John the Baptist."

of which He proceeds, but He has no special rôle to fulfil, and His presence in that description seems due merely to literary reminiscence." [1] Other elements of the complete picture, e.g. the return of Elias, the appearance of Belial or Antichrist, are even less constant. They belong only to some streams of the Apocalyptic tradition. But the Coming Age, whether in earth or in "a new heaven and a new earth," is the main topic everywhere.

It does not nowadays need proving that the conception of the Kingdom of God, the proximity of which had already been announced by John, was absolutely central in the preaching of our Lord. The fact was obscured in Harnack's *What is Christianity?*, but Loisy in *L'Évangile et l'Église* had no difficulty in shewing that Harnack was in that respect mistaken. And since then no one has doubted that Loisy was so far right. To prove this we should perhaps most naturally turn first to S. Mark, as the earliest Gospel, or to S. Matthew, which is particularly the Gospel of the Kingdom. But their evidence may be taken for granted, and for S. Luke it will suffice to refer to such passages as iv. 43, viii. 1, ix. 2, 60, xi. 20, xviii. 29.

Further, it is clear that our Lord took over, at least in the first instance, the conception of the Kingdom as a well-known and well-understood thing. He nowhere defines it. Even the parables are not formal definitions of its nature. It need not be said that He approved only the more ethical and spiritual parts of the contemporary belief, and that to those He made His own supreme contribution.[2] This would be proved by the account of the Temptation, if by nothing else. But that selection and amplification can be more conveniently considered when we come to our Lord's own connexion with the kingdom that He proclaimed. And to that we come at once. In the Coming Kingdom what place does He assign to Himself?

Some (not all) of the Apocalyptic books find the centre of their hopes for the future in the appearance of a personal Deliverer. This Deliverer gradually becomes more personal. In Daniel vii.

[1] R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, p. 50.

[2] E.g. the character consistently demanded in those who should inherit the Kingdom. "For Jesus, the present usurper of the sovereignty was not Cæsar, but the devil" (McNeile, *S. Matthew*, p. xxii.).

13–18, the Son of Man is a collective term, hardly individual at all.[1] In some parts of the later Book, or rather Books, of Enoch he is a distinct, personal Figure, Who is to bring in from His pre-existent state, with every evidence of supernatural and divine power, the Kingdom or Reign of God.

Among the more striking passages are :

(1) And there I saw One, who had a head of days,
And His head was white like wool,
And with Him was another being whose countenance had the appearance of a man,
And his face was full of graciousness, like one of the holy angels.

And I asked the angel who went with me and shewed me all the hidden things, concerning the Son of Man, who he was, and whence he was, [and] why he went with the Head of Days. And he answered and said unto me :

This is the Son of Man who hath righteousness,
With whom dwelleth righteousness,
And also revealeth all the treasures of that which is hidden,

Because the Lord of Spirits hath chosen him
And whose lot hath the pre-eminence before the Lord of Spirits in uprightness for ever.

And this Son of Man whom thou hast seen
Shall raise up the kings and mighty from their seats
And the strong from their thrones

And shall loosen the reins of the strong,
And break the teeth of the sinners ;

And he shall put down the kings from their thrones and kingdoms
Because they do not extol and praise Him,
Nor humbly acknowledge whence the kingdom was bestowed upon them.

And he shall put down the countenance of the strong,
And shall fill them with shame.

And darkness shall be their dwelling,
And worms shall be their bed,

[1] Thus in Dan. vii. 13–14 " the Kingdom " is given to " one like unto a son of man," but in verse 18 it is received by " the saints of the Most High."

And they shall have no hope of rising from their beds
Because they do not extol the name of the Lord of Spirits [c. xlvi.].

(2) And at that hour the Son of Man was named
In the presence of the Lord of Spirits,
And his name before the Head of Days.

Yea, before the Sun and the Signs were created,
Before the stars of the heaven were made,
His name was named before the Lord of Spirits.

He shall be a staff to the righteous whereon to stay themselves and not fall,
And he shall be a light of the Gentiles
And the hope of those who are humbled of heart.

All who dwell on earth shall fall down and worship before him,
And will praise and bless and celebrate with song the Lord of Spirits.
And for this reason hath he been chosen and hidden before him,
Before the creation of the world and for evermore [c. xlviii.].

(3) For from the beginning the Son of Man was hidden
And the most High preserved him in the presence of His might,
And revealed him to the elect.

And the congregation of the elect and holy shall be sown,
And all the elect shall stand before him on that day.

And all the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who rule the earth
Shall fall down before him on their faces,
And worship and set their hope upon that Son of Man,
And petition him and supplicate for mercy at his hands [c. lxii.].

(4) And he sat on the throne of his glory,
And the sum of judgment was given unto the Son of Man,
And he caused the sinners to pass away and be destroyed from off the face of the earth
And those who have led the world astray.

With chains shall they be bound,
And in their assemblage-place of destruction shall they be imprisoned,
And all their works vanish from the face of the earth;
And from henceforth there shall be nothing corruptible,

For that Son of Man has appeared,
And he seated himself on the throne of his glory,
And all evil shall pass away before his face,
And the word of the Son of Man shall go forth
And be strong before the Lord of Spirits [1] [c. lxix.].

It would be possible to quote from other books, e.g. the glowing anticipations of a Davidic King in the Pharisaic Psalms of Solomon (xvii. and xviii.) or the spiritual teaching of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. But it must suffice to have given specimens of one book, though it must be borne in mind that the picture there drawn is the most transcendental of all.

The passages quoted are all from the Similitudes or Parables of Enoch, i.e. chapters xxxvii.–lxxi. of the composite book, a portion which is dated between 105 and 64 B.C. It represents "a great and noteworthy advance on the earlier conception of the Messiah, and an approximation to the ethical and spiritual Christology of the Gospels." [2] It may be taken as certain that Our Lord made large use of this conception in order to describe His own office and function, though it is fair to add that He combined with it other elements. It is a great mistake to isolate the Apocalyptic element either in the general course of development of the Jewish Church or in our estimate of the material available for and used by our Lord. He stands at the end of the whole line of the Law, the Prophets and the Writings. He Himself sums up the series in Lk. xvi. 16: "The Law and the Prophets were until John; from that time the good news of the kingdom of heaven is announced." One of His main controversies

[1] The Book of Enoch was held in high esteem by the early Church, and was commonly supposed to be the work of the Patriarch. It is expressly quoted in Jude 14, and the New Testament contains many echoes of its language, e.g. Lk. i. 52, ix. 35, xxiii. 35 ("the Elect One"), xvi. 8 ("sons of the light"), xvi. 9 ("mammon of unrighteousness"), xviii. 7 ("the prayer of God's elect"), xxi. 28 (the drawing nigh of redemption). The so-called Epistle of Barnabas quotes it twice (iv. 3, xvi. 5) as "Scripture." In the second case the comment is added "and it came to pass as the Lord spake." The Jews from about A.D. 100 rejected it, partly because of its popularity with the Christians and partly because with the Fall of Jerusalem Judaism turned in another direction and passed into Rabbinism. From the time of S. Augustine the Church ceased to use it, and it was practically lost for centuries. It was rediscovered in Abyssinia in 1773, and the first English translation was made in 1821. The version here used is that of Dr. Charles, from whose *Book of Enoch*, pp. 48–49, the above parallels with S. Luke are quoted.

[2] W. V. Hague in *Journal of Theological Studies*, Oct. 1910, p. 95.

with contemporary Judaism was over His claim to revise the Mosaic Law, a claim in which there is no sign of any eschatological motive. He deals with the Temptations, with the Sabbath, with Divorce, with Immortality, with the Law of Charity, by means of quotations which penetrate to the true meaning of the Old Testament as a whole, and reveal it as it had never been understood before. In general, it may be said that He handles the whole Jewish Bible with so familiar and masterly a touch that it would clearly be mistaken to suppose that He employed only its last phase.

Further, in connexion with His actual use of the Enochian conception, it seems certain that He combined with it other specific associations. "We turn the page," writes Dr. Sanday, "which separates the New Testament from the Old. We look at the Figure which is delineated there, and we find in it a marvellous meeting of traits derived from the most different and distant sources. . . . And these traits do not meet, as we might expect them to do, in some laboured and artificial compound, but in the sweet and gracious figure of Jesus of Nazareth—King, but not as men count kingship, crowned, but with the crown of thorns; suffering for our redemption, but suffering only that He may reign."[1] The most important of the actual elements in our Lord's fulfilment of the Old Testament as a whole, over and above His special appropriation of the later Apocalyptic, appear to be (1) the simpler conception of the Son of Man, which is found in Psalm viii. and in Ezekiel (where it is used for the prophet himself), (2) the conception of the Suffering Servant from Isaiah liii.,[2] and (3) the conception of the "lowly" or "poor" king from Zech. ix. 9. And, as we shall see directly, there was much in His self-consciousness for which no existing category was at all adequate.

By the time of our Lord's Baptism the Old Testament, reinforced by the Apocalyptic literature (a literature which intensifies

[1] *Inspiration*, p. 405.

[2] This is not so obvious as it may seem. Although the passage was at once seized upon by Christian writers (e.g. Acts viii. 32–35; 1 Peter ii. 22–25), and has held its place ever since as the classical prediction of Good Friday, it is not expounded in any detail by Our Lord. Lk. xxii. 22 (cp. Is. liii. 6 and 12, LXX.—*παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ*) and 37 (cp. Is. liii. 12) are significant, and there is the famous *λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν* (cp. Is. liii. 11). Scott (*op. cit.*, p. 217 f.) gives reasons for supposing that the prophecy "was of cardinal importance for the Messianic thought of Jesus.

a conception already prominent in the Old Testament, viz. the nearness of the Coming Day), had produced an immense impression on Palestinian Judaism. The impression was both religious and political. For example, the allusions in Daniel to the Syrian oppressor were applied by the Jews of the first century to the Roman domination. The expectation that this would somehow be overthrown and that the people of God would enter upon their long-promised heritage grew almost to fever-heat.

The Zealots, of whom there was at least one, and perhaps more, among the Twelve, were the party who only waited for a leader to raise the old Maccabean war-cry, and to unfurl the patriotic banner with the watchwords of "Judæa for the Jews," and "Down with Rome." This done, the political revolution would pass into a cosmic renewal, and God would at last establish His Kingdom securely in a new and different world. And on the other hand, the hopes cherished by the little circle described in the opening chapters of the Gospel of S. Luke, e.g. Simeon, who was "looking for the consolation of Israel" (ii. 25) and those "looking for the redemption of Israel" to whom Anna spoke (ii. 38), were quieter and less political, but eager and intense.

No doubt the two groups overlapped. The more religious were not unpolitical, and the more political were far from wholly secular.

Our Lord Himself not only accepted the general expectation of a coming Age and a coming Kingdom, but at the head of it He placed Himself. It is possible to meet in critical writings with occasional denials that He ever claimed in His own lifetime to be Messiah, or that He ever used the title "Son of Man"; and it may well be that He adopted the Messiah-conception with profound consciousness of its inadequacy, and perhaps even with reluctance, and that He used the title "Son of Man" with much less frequency and with a more specialized meaning than the Gospels indicate. But at least the whole later course of the Ministry, and above all the Trial and Crucifixion, prove that the overwhelming majority of critics are right in believing Him to have claimed both the status of Messiah and the Enochian title.

It is surely incredible that one who clearly knew Himself to

be of unique spiritual stature, to have a unique relation to both God and men, could have failed, in using these current conceptions of a Coming Dispensation, to connect it with Himself. And the uniqueness—to use for the moment no more specific word—of both nature and relation is undisputed. It would be easy to quote from writers, whose formulated belief is that He "did not overstep the limitations of pure humanity," passages of which the passionate enthusiasm makes one wonder whether, in Dr. Sanday's words, "all this spiritual value is legitimately obtained." [1] How is it possible to suppose that He Who so called men to let Him lead them into the Kingdom did not also know that He would be there in power and glory to meet them when they arrived? "I am, and ye shall see" (Mk. xiv. 62).

The Kingdom itself was and could only be the Kingdom of Almighty God, the Lord of Spirits, the Ancient of Days. Our Lord conceived of His own part in it, as of each single step of His earthly pilgrimage, as that which should be committed to Him by the Father. But in the Kingdom He Who was now God's Pilgrim, yet even now God's Chosen, God's Beloved, would at last be at home in His own proper sphere, the Prince of Glory, the wielder of divine authority, and would say to those on His right hand, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom that has been prepared." [2]

Even in this world, unlike the Apocalyptists, who wrote anonymously, and indeed pseudonymously, Our Lord speaks in His own person, like a prophet. And even the prophets He transcends. They were content to say, "Thus saith the Lord." His formula is, "Amen, I say unto you."

Already He is "the Son," to Whom "all things have been delivered by the Father" (Lk. x. 22; Mt. xi. 27). God is His Father in a sense in which none else may use the term. "None knoweth the Father save the Son." [3] He claims authority to

[1] C. F. Nolloth, *The Person of Our Lord and Recent Thought*, has collected a number of such passages, p. 354 f.

[2] Mt. xxv. 34. The section Mt. xxv. 31–46 has much in common with Enoch lxii.

[3] For the "absolute" use of "the Son," "the Father," cp. Mk. xiii. 32; the use has thus the authority of the two most ancient sources of the Gospel material. If it be allowable to assume, with Harnack, that Mt. xi. 28–30, which are not in Luke, stood in an original source and are authentic (they can hardly have stood *at this point* in the source used by Matthew and Luke), Our Lord, echoing Ecclus. li. 23–27, identifies Himself with Wisdom. Cp. Lk. xi. 49, which is perhaps a quotation from some unknown book

restate the sacred Law, in the divine origin of which his hearers and Himself alike believed. His words will survive the passing away of heaven and earth. Already He forgives and summons men to follow Him. "Messiah" and "Son of Man" refer to the future, and to the present only in so far as it is an anticipation and instalment of the future. But consciousness of that which has been rightly named Divinity is the fixed centre of His thoughts about Himself. "He Who already in His present state of existence is more than a prophet and greater than John, He Who is the *Son*, will be the coming King and Judge." [1]

The question of questions then is—How definite was this consciousness? How certain?

We can see in the Gospels the disciples beginning to feel after the true doctrine of the Person of the Master. We know the exalted categories in which a few years later S. Paul and others strove to express their own experience.[2] And we know the Nicene theology. The comparative slowness of the process is due to the fact that the mind of man was overwhelmed by the personality of Jesus. Only in the course of years does it become at all competent to receive—much more to express—the world-shaking conception of "God with us." And even now the process

(Harnack, *Sayings*, p. 103), with Mt. xxiii. 34. The Divine Wisdom is one of the ideas which make up the full content of the Johannine Logos.

[1] Harnack, *Sayings*, p. 244. The same writer draws particular attention to the following passages, among others, as coming from the oldest source, i.e. Q (see p. 136 f.): Lk. x. 15, 16, Capernaum is lifted up to Heaven by our Lord's Ministry there, and "He that rejecteth me rejecteth Him that sent me"; xi. 31, 32, "greater than Solomon, greater than Jonah"; xii. 8, "Every one that confesseth me before men," etc.; xii. 52, "From now households are to be divided"; xiii. 34, the claim over the allegiance of the holy city of Jerusalem; xiv. 26, 27, "if any man hateth not . . . whosoever taketh not up his cross," etc.; and in the Sermon on the Mount, which is "above the level of a prophetic manifesto," "obedience to His commandments is treated as the same thing as doing the Will of the Father" (p. 236). These passages are from a source of which Harnack believes that it "was intended solely for the Christian community and was addressed to those who did not require the assurance that their Teacher was also the Son of God [and] . . . was not compiled in the interests of Christian apologetics" (p. 235).

[2] These are still fluid in S. Paul. They have not yet crystallized into formal dogmatics. "What was sought for in Christianity was an immediate fellowship with God, and it was felt, as a simple fact of experience, that through Jesus Christ this fellowship had been rendered possible. The Messianic idea could afford no explanation of such a fact. . . . There needed to be some deeper relation between Jesus and God if the Father was truly present in the Son, bringing the believer into communion with Himself. The growth of this conviction is traceable in the writings of Paul. He accepts the Messianic category, but . . . he is seeking his way towards some other theory of Christ's Person, which should correspond more adequately to the demands of Christian faith" (E. F. Scott, *Apologetic of the New Testament*, p. 65).

of reception and expression is not nearly finished. What then of the human mind of Our Lord Himself? His method is intuitive, not philosophical. He teaches what He knows. What does He know about Himself? It appears to me that the more firmly we believe in the fact of the Incarnation, the less we shall be disposed to assert that He knew the whole truth about Himself. Man can know God. Man can believe in God. But Man cannot comprehend God. How then could Jesus comprehend Himself? How could the life, of which the actual purpose was to express the Divine Nature in terms of veritable human kind, have an unlimited comprehension of its own Divine Selfhood? He knew God, and He uttered without doubt or hesitation the Truth about God and Man. He was Himself the perfect Revelation of God. His arrival upon earth was the consecration of humanity; His death was its redemption; His resurrection its victory; and His ascension its coronation. But if it be conceded—as it must be—first, that His whole Revelation was mediated through the human nature of a Galilean peasant, and, secondly, that Divine Revelation is a thing which, in so far as it has actually proved comprehensible to our own human nature, has been comprehended only by long centuries of Christian experience, it seems improbable that consciousness of Divinity could emerge in any other way than the way of Our Lord in the Gospels. The highest known categories are filled and exhausted, and there is the overwhelming intuitive consciousness that somehow He transcends them all.[1]

Tyrrell has written:

"Jesus believed that He was destined to be revealed to all the world in the clouds of heaven as the Son of Man. Probably, if not certainly, He understood this destination as more than moral or decretorial, as an inherent potentiality of His own spirit. Already He spoke and acted as God's plenipotentiary . . . this points to a sense of present, and not merely of prospective, superhuman dignity. Not till He was glorified, however, would He be technically the Christ and assume the full functions of the Son of Man. Now it is idle to contend that this was something secondary in the

[1] It is clearly desirable that speculations on so mysterious a subject should be expressed in a cautious and tentative way. I am reminded by a friendly critic that it is just in the sphere of self-knowledge that Our Lord's mind would doubtless go farthest; also that the "Galilean peasant" argument loses much of its force in the case of one whose moral and spiritual knowledge was manifestly so profound. In any case, my sole desire is to discover what exactly is involved by belief in the Incarnation.

self-consciousness of Jesus; a little touch of the megalomania so frequently attendant on genius and on the realization of unusual influence and power; a fiery tongue of fanaticism, shooting up from the pure flame of faith. He does not begin as an ethical teacher or a prophet, and then warm up to new and astounding pretensions. His attitude is the same throughout, and is just such as consists with the secret consciousness of His Messianic dignity. That consciousness is the cause, and not the effect, of His soul-compelling power. His belief in Himself makes others believe in Him. . . . They asked themselves: 'What manner of man is this?' What won their love and affection was the lowliness and gentleness of One whom they felt, through an irrepressible emanation of His own self-consciousness, to be mysteriously great and strong and holy." [1]

But always the Treasure is in an earthen vessel. Our Lord, Who would not give any overwhelming "sign" to the Pharisees, claimed no such "sign" for Himself. His consciousness of Son-ship was rather in the realm of religion than of metaphysics, or even theology.

Let us take an illustration from the Cross, the supreme instance, which resolves all difficulties. Religiously, it is satisfying; philosophically, it is difficult. We only arrive at a true theological understanding of the matter when our philosophy is enlightened and spiritualized by our religion. And what is true of the Cross is true also of the whole life of the Incarnate. The more we connect the Passion with the whole of Our Lord's earthly life, the better we shall understand both. Now, we are accustomed to find in the Fourth Word from the Cross the tragic heart of the Atonement. Without that, we feel that the testing would not have been complete, the champion would not have endured the last stage of conflict, the Conqueror would not have perfectly established His own conquest. And so it appears that in the very hour of victory He seemed to Himself to be failing—and yet He still held on. It was the last ounce of the redemptive burden, the last item in the price of perfect victory. In somewhat the same way—not altogether, for Our Lord's life was not a perpetual crucifixion—may we not say that His consciousness of Divinity was not a matter of logic or of memory, but of intuition and religious faith?

It is, indeed, often suggested that we can distinguish stages

[1] *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, p. 179.

in Our Lord's belief about Himself, a gradual acceptance of Messiahship, a gradual acceptance of the prospect of death, and so on. I think myself that such distinctions are often precarious, because the Gospel criticism [1] on which they depend is of a partially subjective nature, and also because Our Lord comes before us in the Gospels with His mind much more made up and His path much more determined than is sometimes supposed. But there is no *a priori* objection to finding such stages, if they can be found.[2] It was said lately in a perhaps hasty criticism of a learned and stimulating book [3] that in the opinion of the author, "Jesus did not know whether He was the Messiah or not." Supposing that the intention of the author had been to assert that Our Lord did not know whether He was great enough to claim the title, it would have been intolerable indeed. But the fact is—and the intention of the author was to assert—that He must have felt the title to be inadequate.

Our Lord welcomed the outburst of S. Peter, He accepted the Messiah-conception and was content that it should be the occasion of His death. And more particularly He accepted and used the highly Apocalyptic conception of Messiahship which is connoted by the Enochian title. Why? Partly as He accepted the Aramaic language—because it was at hand. But more, because those were the highest forms available, because those were the ways in which God the Father had gradually taught the Chosen People to anticipate the Bringer of the Kingdom which Our Lord knew that He was Himself to bring.

We are prepared, of course, to find that He was not precisely the kind of Messiah that was anticipated. It is surely of the essence of God's gift to be more than we either deserve or desire. So Dr. L. P. Jacks puts into the mouth of his "psychologist among the saints" the illuminating fancy that Our Lord "was Man in so far as He did what was expected and God in so far as

[1] In S. Luke's Gospel it is hardly to be attempted, and therefore I do not here consider suggestions which have been put forward. It must be found, if anywhere, in the Gospel of S. Mark.

[2] E.g. Harnack finds "Son-consciousness" in Our Lord at an earlier date than "Messiah-consciousness" (*Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 245 n., 301).

[3] *The Eschatology of Jesus*, by Dr. H. L. Jackson, from many of whose conclusions I venture to differ a good deal. For the allusion in the text see, e.g., p. 64 and cp. pp. 325, 327.

He took the world by surprise."[1] And so at the beginning of the Ministry we see Our Lord confronted by the question whether He should be the kind of political-apocalyptic Messiah and bring in the kind of political-apocalyptic kingdom that was largely anticipated. The story of the Temptation in the wilderness shews Him meeting and rejecting three false conceptions of Messiahship. And all through the Ministry we find Him constantly and consistently refusing to be identified with narrow, worldly, purely national or purely political Messianic ideas.

But, of course, no one can deny that a considerable portion of Our Lord's teaching, as it is recorded in the Gospels, is of an Apocalyptic character. From the early proclamation—"Repent, for the Kingdom of God is at hand,"[2] to the predictions about the last days which form the contents of S. Mark xiii. and its parallels in S. Matthew and S. Luke, there is a great deal of Apocalyptic. Far more of the parables and sayings than is commonly supposed are eschatological, that is, have reference to a future coming of the Kingdom which will mean, in some real sense, the end of the existing world. Of that Kingdom "He was already the proleptic head."[3] It is not easy to ascertain, especially in this connexion, how far the Gospels, as they stand, represent the actual words and specific teaching of Our Lord. It has been suggested that much of the imagery which He is represented as using (e.g. "The sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken") was put into His mouth by the Evangelists, because they assumed that He must have used the language with which they were themselves familiar. Many critics, for example, would assign a substantial part of the

[1] *Among the Idol-makers*, p. 328.

[2] It has often been pointed out that even here two elements are combined. "Repent" is ethical: "the kingdom is at hand" is eschatological (Lake, *Earlier Epistles*, p. 443).

[3] The word is Professor Lake's, who says: "The use of this technical term of the grammarians may be excused by the difficulty of finding any expression to convey the required meaning. The point is that the kingdom was not yet come, and therefore there could not yet be any king; but it was quite certain that it was coming, and that Jesus would be the king. The Christians lived in a constant anticipation of the future, a 'prolepsis' of things to come" (*Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 14 n.). Cp. Schweitzer, *Quest*, p. 284. Reference of the whole kingdom to the future seems to need qualification, especially when it is realized that Professor Lake is speaking of the period not of the Gospels but of the early chapters of Acts. See *infra*, p. 101 f.

eschatological discourse reported in S. Mark xiii. and its parallels to another source.[1] They do not believe that more than about a third of it was really spoken by Him. And whether or not we handle this particular discourse as freely as, for example, Dr. Charles and Canon Streeter have done, there is little doubt that in the early Church, and to some extent in the Gospels, His teaching on such subjects was sharpened and exaggerated. We know from S. Paul's earlier Epistles (1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians) that he expected (at first consistently, afterwards with some hesitation) that the end of the world would come in his own lifetime, and there are a great number of passages in Acts and elsewhere which are only to be explained by supposing that the same expectation was commonly entertained. There was therefore a natural tendency to amplify whatever of Apocalyptic Our Lord's own words had contained. It seems certain that

[1] It is held by very many critics that Mk. xiii. and the parallels include "a written fly-leaf of early Christian apocalyptic prophecy, or 'small apocalypse,' consisting of material set in the ordinary triple division, common to apocalyptic literature," i.e. (*a*) ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων, (*b*) θλῖψις, (*c*) παρουσία. See Moffatt, *Introd. to Lit. of New Testament*, pp. 207–209, where weighty support is quoted for this opinion. It is further supposed that this prophecy was the "divine revelation" mentioned by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 5, 3) which caused the Christian population of Jerusalem to flee to Pella before the destruction of the city. A few critics hold that the fly-leaf was a Jewish Apocalypse, which was taken over and Christianized. See on the whole question Charles, *Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, 2nd ed., pp. 379 f., and Streeter in *Oxford Studies*, pp. 179–183. Cf. Stanton, *Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii. 115–121; Winstanley, *Jesus and the Future*, p. 205 f. The argument is not purely *a priori*; it is largely based on the fact that the long discourse of Mk. xiii. is a unique feature in that Gospel, and on the nature of its contents.

On the other hand, Prof. Lake suggests a qualification of this verdict: "I think that the Synoptic Gospels give us a correct account of the facts, and I see no reason for the excision of Mark xiii., or of parts of it, as a Jewish interpolation. . . . The critics who deny that this view was that of Jesus may possibly be right, but at all events the Synoptic Gospels were largely written to prove the opposite" (*Earlier Epistles*, p. 436). Prof. Lake is not exactly controverting the authors quoted above, but rather those who maintain that Our Lord's teaching has been seriously misrepresented by the importation into the record of it of practically the whole eschatological element. So Prof. Burkitt, who considers that the chapter is founded upon a separate written document, adds that "both the general purport of the discourse and most of the single sayings seem to me, if I may venture to give an opinion, perfectly to harmonize with what we otherwise know of the teaching of Jesus" (*Gospel History*, p. 63). And Dr. Sanday has said: "When it seemed that these features could be thus got rid of, the hypothesis by means of which the amputation was performed was eagerly welcomed and from that time onward has been a generally accepted part of the liberal tradition. But we must distinctly recognize that it is nothing more than a hypothesis. The proof of it is very far from being stringent. It is one thing to say that certain verses are detachable from their context, and another thing to infer that they ought to be detached. For myself I fail to see how the decision can ever be final" (*Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1911, p. 95).

this tendency was actually in operation during the gradual compilation of the Gospels.

But when all possible deductions have been made, it seems most unlikely that the Church would depart altogether, or even very widely, from the Master's own standpoint. The amplification was one of terms and emphasis, not an importation of fundamental ideas. In any case a number of eschatological parables and sayings remain. No criticism could excise them all, and it so happens that most of them are of such a kind as to approve themselves. For my own part, I am sure that wholesale excision would be not only a critical blunder but a religious loss. For it is a great satisfaction to be able to feel that the old academic Liberal Protestant conception of Our Lord has been finally disposed of. The old Liberal Protestants were quite sure that Our Lord was one of themselves.[1] He was depicted by some scholars as a kind of lecturer-philanthropist, enunciating valuable ethical maxims and anxious to ameliorate the general condition of mankind. And it was sometimes even gravely pointed out that these maxims were clothed in a religious phraseology for which, considering the age in which He lived and the nationality to which He belonged, every allowance must be made. All this is now seen to be impossible, and Christianity re-emerges as a

[1] Matthew Arnold had in many ways a wonderful understanding of the "Secret of Jesus" and the value of the Bible. But, apart from the illegitimacy of his dogmatic rejection of dogma, even his criticism was largely vitiated by his nineteenth-century prepossessions. Thus he writes (*Literature and Dogma*, chap. vi): "Take, again, the eschatology of the disciples . . . a literal appropriation of the apocalyptic pictures of the book of Daniel and the book of Enoch. . . . It is not surprising . . . what *is* remarkable is that they should themselves supply us with their Master's blame of their too literal criticism, his famous sentence, 'The kingdom of God is within you.' Such an account of the kingdom of God has more right, even if recorded only once, to pass with us for Jesus Christ's own account than the common materializing accounts, if repeated twenty times; for it was manifestly quite foreign to the disciples' own notions, and they never could have invented it."

The "reduced Christianity" of German Protestantism is not really historical. Even the glowing enthusiasm of Harnack's *What is Christianity?* (1900) was not adequate as an explanation of the phenomena. But Harnack speaks later (*Sayings of Jesus*, p. 232) of "the sovereignty of the eschatological point of view," though he wisely adds that this is not to be sought only in "dramatic eschatology." But Prof. Bacon still maintains that the significance attached by Jesus Himself to his mission was "purely religio-ethical and humanitarian" (*Beginnings of the Gospel-Story*, p. xxxviii) and that "the apocalyptic figure of the Son of man could not be Jesus' 'favorite self-designation.' . . . Such apocalyptic fanaticism is the characteristic, not of the sane and well-poised mind of the plain mechanic of Nazareth, but of Pharisaism in his own time and of the later generations of his followers" (*ibid.* p. 108).

religion, spiritual, supernatural, other-worldly.[1] The expectation of a coming end of the existing *régime*, a catastrophic upheaval of all that is, and the inauguration by the Son of Man of a new order—this is not the whole of Our Lord's message, it is the burden of some only of His parables and sayings, but it is a not inconsiderable part.

But the discoverers of an overlooked aspect or an unused clue are apt to exaggerate. I mentioned in the last chapter the view of those who allege that the Pauline school conceived of Christianity as a Greek mystery, hardly connected with Nazareth at all. So now the extreme eschatologists, Johannes Weiss, Schweitzer,[2] and those who hold with them, violently repudiating all suggestion that S. Paul or Christianity was influenced by the mysteries, and starting from an opposite, or non-Hellenic, point of view, have succeeded in raising a difficulty, in the present connexion, of almost the same sort.[3] Neglecting the many parables and sayings in the Gospels which are, to use the technical term, non-catastrophic, which speak of gradual growth and find

[1] "It is not an exaggeration, in fact, to say that eschatology means religion' (Headlam, *St. Paul and Christianity*, p. 36). Cp. Burkitt in *Cambridge Biblical Essays* (1909), p. 208. This whole essay is most illuminating, especially when read in the light of subsequent events. The fact that the type of character most worth having is that which is best prepared to face a crisis, and that the future is with those who are able to discern and receive the kingdom of God as it comes riding upon the wings of storm, has become obvious to all. It is extraordinarily interesting that the eschatology of the New Testament should have been rediscovered at the end of a period in which thought had come to be more and more dominated by evolutionary conceptions, and that the rediscovery should be followed immediately by a period of "distress of nations, with perplexity, men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth" (Lk. xxi. 25, 26).

[2] An account of the German writers of this school will be found in Sanday's *Life of Christ in Recent Research*. See, in particular, Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, translated under the title of *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, with an introduction by Prof. Burkitt. The main part of the book is occupied with a survey of German Lives of Jesus, and Schweitzer's own interpretation, except for incidental comments and criticisms, appears only on pp. 328–401. E. F. Scott's *The Kingdom and the Messiah* is an illuminating exposition of the whole subject. Slighter but in some ways more constructive is E. G. Selwyn's *The Teaching of Christ*. Father Tyrrell in his later writings, e.g. *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, took over, with a rather uncritical want of discrimination, the views of the thoroughgoing eschatologists. C. W. Emmet's *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels* contains a searching criticism of Schweitzer.

[3] "We must be prepared to find that the historical knowledge of the personality and life of Jesus will not be a help, but perhaps even an offence to religion. But the truth is, it is not Jesus as historically known, but Jesus as spiritually arisen within men, who is significant for our time and can help it. . . . The abiding and eternal in Jesus is absolutely independent of historical knowledge and can only be understood by contact with His spirit, which is still at work in the world. In proportion as we have the spirit of Jesus we have the true knowledge of Jesus" (*Quest*, p. 399).

a large element of permanence in the existing situation, passing over all this, Schweitzer alleges that Our Lord's own message practically consisted of a brief announcement of the rapidly approaching end; that what appears to be ethical teaching was really only an interim programme[1] for the few months that remained before the shock; that He expected till the very last that God would justify Him before the eyes of men by visibly bringing in the Kingdom, with falling stars and darkened sun; that the cry, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" was wrung from Him by the failure of this hope, and that He died, for this reason, of a broken heart. In spite, however, of this conspicuous and total disappointment, the disciples somehow carried on the expectation that He would return in glory, and were so "obsessed" with eschatology that they tended to regard the Ministry as purely preliminary, and to regard Jesus as a sort of John Baptist to Himself, a *Messias futurus*, a forerunner of His other, greater self Who was soon to come. Thus we are reduced from a quite different point of view to much the same conclusion as that of the mystery-school, that Galilee is unimportant. Or rather, perhaps, that it is important, but only in a negative way. It is important to discover what the historical Jesus was, but the discovery lands us in a *cul-de-sac*. The world-view of Jesus is not transferable to us. His actual outlook, with its unmitigated Semitism, its strict predestinarianism, its entire preoccupation with the end of the world, the baldly provisional nature of its ethic, is not for us. The ordinary interpretation of even the Markan picture is confused and garbled. Theologians read what they want between the lines; they illegitimately "book through-tickets at the supplementary-psychological-knowledge office" (*Quest*, p. 331). And as for what is described in this book as the Lukan "solution," it is not even considered. It would be dismissed as the desperate expedient of what an American professor has called an "entangling alliance of theology and history."

Albert Schweitzer has not always had justice done to him. His doctrine, strange and distasteful as much of it must seem to old-fashioned Christians, or indeed to Christians of any sort, is

[1] *Interimsethik*, or "Meantime-morality."

nevertheless a real religion. He has a passionate devotion to Jesus, and in 1913 he laid down his academic position at Strasburg in order to become a missionary in French Equatorial Africa.[1] His defect is that he is one-sided and exaggerated. The truth about Jesus is too great to be completely seen from any single standpoint. No single category is able to contain Him. The truth is more comprehensive than is supposed by either the Mystery school or the thoroughgoing Eschatologists.[2]

One simple fact, which is enough to prevent us from accepting the theory of Schweitzer in its entirety, is the fact that Christianity survived, that it made and commended its appeal to Greeks and Romans, and became a world-religion. It cannot therefore have consisted wholly of the expectation of the end of the world. A religion which pins its faith entirely to an anticipated event must abide by the decision of time, especially when that decision is mediated through persons to whom the earlier categories are uncongenial. But this, though a fair counter, is hardly a solution.[3]

[1] See an interesting article, "Schweitzer as Missionary," by his English translator, Mr. Montgomery, in *Hibbert Journal*, July 1914.

[2] It may well be that the only "thoroughgoing eschatologists" in early days were the disciples of John, who appear in Acts xix. 1 f. If so, the fact that they are described as "disciples" and that they consorted to some extent with the Church, proves that the Church itself was highly eschatological. But both they and Apollos (xviii. 24–28) clearly lack something, which, when the fact is discovered, is at once supplied, and the sect did not as a matter of fact survive. If it be true that the Fourth Gospel is in part directed against them, it would help to account for the almost complete disappearance of the eschatological element in that Gospel. The explanation of J. H. A. Hart in *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, Oct. 1905; Lake, *Earlier Epistles*, p. 107 f., that they were familiar with "Old Testament prophecies of the Messiah," gives rather a forced explanation to the phrase in Acts xviii. 25, "the things concerning *Jesus*," a difficulty which Harnack to some extent gets over by supposing (*Luke the Physician*, p. 150) that "the baptism of John" means the baptism by John of Jesus.

[3] On the other hand, it is equally undeniable that "had the early Christians devoted themselves to the well-to-do philanthropy of the nineteenth century, they never would have survived at all" (Burkitt, *Gospel History*, p. 182). "Unnecessary difficulty has often been felt in the fact that the Parousia of the Messiah did not take place, and has not yet taken place, as a catastrophic event as He pictured it. He Himself balanced the Jewish language by non-Jewish conceptions. But the pictorial language must be frankly accepted as Jewish. His human intellect, like all other human intellects before and since, was compelled—not consciously but inevitably—to employ symbolism in order to express the transcendental; and He employed that of His age and country, the language of prophets and apocalyptists of the past. (See the classical exposition of this by Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, chaps. x, xii.) The divine translation of it in history must be seen, as the evangelists recognized, in the Christian Church, which was, in fact, born in a sudden outburst within the generation then living and which, in its ideal, is a polity of redeemed souls living in righteousness, over whom God reigns on earth in the Person of Jesus the Messiah" (McNeile, *S. Matthew*, p. xxvi.).

There is a "solution," and it is largely furnished by S. Luke. But before coming to it, I should like to make it clear that in my own opinion, to a considerable extent, no solution, in the strict sense, is required. Our Lord was, among other things, a prophet. The vision of the prophet is fixed upon eternal things. He thus approaches, according to his capacity, the timeless vision of God. He goes to the heart of the matter, and proclaims that which is of supreme importance, namely, that God has a purpose for His people. The result is that he tends to neglect time,[1] which is in itself a thing of secondary importance and belongs, as philosophers would say, to appearance rather than to reality. We therefore find that the Old Testament prophets often seem to anticipate that the coming deliverance will follow immediately upon the present distress.[2] The sureness with which their vision penetrates to the important central truth makes them foreshorten the time which the divine Operation will actually take.[3] Our Lord is no exception to this prophetic law. On the other hand He uses it, and is not used by it. He does not succumb to the Apocalyptic habit. He guards Himself against being supposed to be a purveyor of arithmetical prognostications. He abandons altogether the calculations of "a time, and times, and half a time" and "seventy weeks" and so forth, which were a favourite feature of Jewish Apocalyptic, and recur again in the Revelation of S. John. He says expressly that "of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father" (Mk. xiii. 32).[4] He deprecates (in Acts i. 7) the desire to "know times and seasons, which the Father hath set within His own authority." But it seems impossible to deny that Our Lord did mentally

[1] Not always. Jeremiah knows that the Captivity will last seventy years. But the more apocalyptic prophecy becomes, the more it foreshortens the future.

[2] See above, p. 36. An illuminating sentence of Prof. Lake is quoted by von Dobschütz (*Echatology of the Gospels*, p. 68): "The Jew is separated from the realm of bliss by time, the Greek by space."

[3] Cp. Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, p. 159.

[4] The Bishop of Zanzibar has an instructive comment on this passage: "Here we meet the one great fact of human life, that no human mind can conceive. To know the day and hour of judgment is to know each single soul, to trace the history of each family and tribe and nation, to see all men and nations in one whole, and to become conscious of the exact moment of time in which the lines of opportunity of individuals and nations come to an end, meeting in the single point of completed destiny. In fact, it is to have universal relations to the creation: the very thing which that Son of God renounced, within a definite sphere, when He became Incarnate" (*The One Christ*, p. 199).

foreshorten the time which would be required for His religion to leaven the world.

This was, in fact, one of the chief intellectual problems which the early Church had to solve. How were they to explain the non-fulfilment of the Lord's prediction of a speedy Return in glory and their own expectations of such a Return? The author of 2 Peter is expressing a widely felt difficulty when he reminds his readers of the mockers who say, "Where is the promise of His coming? For from the day that the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation" (iii. 4). The Gospels, especially the Gospel of S. John, were written in order to make it clear that the Good News had not consisted entirely of this expectation. And, in fact, the continued existence of the Church proves that the original message cannot have consisted entirely of this, or anyhow of the crudest form of it. But side by side with the pressure of facts, and the recovery, by means of the Gospels, of something like a complete account of what had really been Our Lord's position in the matter, other forces were at work. As Canon Streeter has said, "The process" (i.e. such a process as I have referred to, of sharpening and heightening Our Lord's Apocalyptic utterances) "was not allowed to go on unchecked. Two great religious geniuses, S. Paul and the author of the Fourth Gospel,[1] stemmed the tide, and by a counter-evolution brought back the Church to profounder and more spiritual conceptions" (*Oxford Studies*, p. 436).

This was, in fact, the "solution." Jesus was rediscovered in the Christ of the Church. S. Paul and S. John spiritualized the eschatological hope.[2] They helped to purge it, where that was necessary, of its purely Jewish dress, its "Hebrew old clothes." And they taught the Church that Pentecost was, in Westcott's phrase, the "Pentecostal coming of the Lord,"[3] that its own life

[1] "The Fourth Gospel is perhaps the only book in the New Testament in which there is no expectation of the Parousia or of the approaching end of the age" (Dr. Inge in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 283; cf. pp. 255, 257, 264, 284. See, however, Jn. v. 25–29).

[2] "What had happened in the meantime? Behind the screen (so to speak) of eschatology the Church had gradually been building up for itself an organized body of thought, the imposing structure of that we call its 'theology'" (Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 114).

[3] *Comm. on S. John*, xiv. 18. Cf. "This descent, this incorporation, of the Spirit was in some sense a second Divine Nativity, the birth of the Church, 'Christ's Body,' the beginning of the order under which we live" (*The Historic Faith*, p. 106).

was the normal continuation of the life of Jesus, and that the Church, to use the common and useful definition, was "an extension of the Incarnation." The fact, already referred to, that S. Paul exhibits some tendency to confuse the work of the Son and the work of the Spirit, a confusion from which it is both impossible and unnecessary for us altogether to escape,[1] and the fact that S. John uses the same word, "Paraclete," in his Gospel (xiv. 16, "another Paraclete," 26, xv. 26, xvi. 7) of the Spirit, and in his First Epistle (ii. 1) of the Son, are evidence enough that the work of the Spirit, and thus, practically, the work of the Church, are regarded as a genuine and proper continuation of the work of Jesus. Such sayings as "There be some here, of them that stand by, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power" (Mk ix. 1) had been in fact verified at Pentecost and were being slowly carried into execution in the Spirit-fed life of the Church. Christ is immanent in the Church. The Church is the Body of Christ. The Church is, therefore, part of Christ. It is the visible part of Christ, that part of Himself through which He now necessarily acts. Indeed, the Book called "Acts," which can also be truly described as the "Gospel of the Holy Spirit," proves that the expression "Body of Christ" is not a mere pious exaggeration, but expresses what the early Christians believed to be a fact. There is no suggestion, either made in Acts or possible to-day, that it has ceased to be necessary either to pray or work in the direction of "Thy Kingdom come," or that there will not be a future culmination, whether gradual or catastrophic; but it is not untrue to say that where Christ is present by His Spirit in His Church, there is the Kingdom. The Church has begun, and consists of those who have already been saved from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of the Son (Col. i. 13; Rom. xiv. 17). The members of the Church, in Acts and in the twentieth century, are very far indeed from being perfect, but their sacraments and

[1] I.e. because the Spirit is in any case the Spirit of Christ, "proceeding from the Father and the Son." His work (Jn. xvi. 14) is to "take of mine and declare it unto y u." "The purpose of Christ's mission was to reveal God as His Father . . . the purpose of the mission of the Holy Spirit is to reveal Christ" (Westcott on Jn. xiv. 26). The orthodox doctrine on the subject, called by the Greeks *perichoresis* and by the Latins *circumincessio*, is that whatever is done by any Person of the Blessed Trinity is done by all. No Person of the Trinity acts singly and alone.

prayers are genuine roads between earth and heaven. "Go, and tell John what things ye do hear and see."

So the Church, which was a great moral engine in a decadent world, seized on the ethical teaching of the Lord. Wherever that teaching had been tinged with eschatological associations, they tended to release it from its associations. When it was absolute, they used it absolutely. And always it seemed to them—and the impression produced upon the world was just the same—that Christ was speaking through His Church. "Christ liveth in me," cries S. Paul. The work that the Master had inaugurated was being continued by the selfsame Master, but it could also be spoken of as the work of the Spirit and the Bride.

It is not intended, of course, to suggest that Pentecost is an isolated thing. It must always be thought of as having been made possible by the Death and Resurrection and Ascension of Our Lord. "It is expedient for you that I go away, for, if I go not away, the Comforter cannot come unto you" is a true statement of the case. "From now," says Our Lord before the Sanhedrin, "from now the Son of Man shall be seated on the right hand of the power of God" (Lk. xxii. 69). The Cross is the first step of the Throne of Glory. A few hours, and Messiah will be reigning from the Tree.[1] I am unable to accept the arguments of some who maintain that the New Testament (except Acts i.) speaks of the Resurrection and Ascension as one act, or the position (still occasionally taken) that the eschatological predictions of the Gospels refer to and are fulfilled by the Resurrection. But it is the fact, as Dr. Latimer Jackson notes, that "no explicit reference to a Coming in the future is placed by the Evangelists in the lips of the Risen Lord."[2] And anyhow it is certain that the Resurrection and Ascension are parts of the same process. They are the essential conditions of the Pentecostal Life. They represent the liberation of the Redeemer from the preliminary and limiting conditions of a single life; they set Him free to return in Spirit to be available for all the world and for all time.

Nor, on the other hand, is it intended to isolate Pentecost from subsequent events. There is no doubt, for example, that our

[1] So E. G. Selwyn, *The Teaching of Christ*, p. 168, and W. Temple, *The Kingdom of God*, p. 36.

[2] *Eschatology of Jesus*, p. 342, n. 2.

Lord foresaw the great crash that was coming on the Jewish nation. His allusions to it have been mingled by the Evangelists with His allusions to the Coming Age. The Christian Church has rightly discerned in the tragedy of A.D. 70 the beginning of a new volume in the history of Christianity, a veritable Coming of the Lord.[1] In like manner the fall of the Roman Empire produced Augustine's *City of God* and mediæval Europe. The Reformation, the French Revolution, and the Great War of the twentieth century are crises in the history of the world. Apocalyptic at such times is apt to revive in questionable shape, but all the same, each such crisis is a Coming of the Lord. And the whole history of the Church, the gradual completion of the Incarnation, the progress of the ever-growing, more inclusive, more Catholic Church, till at last there comes to be the perfect Christ, Christ's ever-perfect self and Christ's now perfected Body, is but the fulfilment of those sayings which shall not pass away.[2]

Now, is it not significant that the author of Acts was also the author of a Gospel? He was the friend of S. Paul, the man who gradually outgrew his early eschatology, who first wrote the primitively eschatological second chapter of 2 Thessalonians and afterwards did so much to spiritualize the eschatological hope, who in his doctrine of the Eucharist combines the Jewish eschatological ideas of the covenant sealed in blood and the proclamation of the Lord's death "till he come," with those other more sacrificial ideas which appealed rather to the Hellenic frequenters of the Mysteries.[3] He was himself the author of Acts, the book which tells how the expectation of a Jewish Messiah was carried over into the formation of a stable, Greek-speaking Church. And he was also the author of a Gospel. Does it not shew there was at least no incompatibility between Nazareth and the life of the Christian Church in the Roman world? Does it not shew that whether he himself conceived of Christianity in the earlier Pauline way as mainly a preparation for a coming Day, or, as is much more probable, in view of his Greek nationality and his equable

[1] Cp. Lk. xxi. 20 with Mk. xiii. 14, Mt. xxiv. 15.

[2] See Westcott on Jn. xiv. 3 and constantly (e.g. *The Historic Faith*, pp. 90 ff.), and cp. Streeter in *Concerning Prayer*, pp. 12–19.

[3] See (*a*) 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26; cf. Mk. xiv. 24, 25; (*b*) 1 Cor. xi. 23–29, x. 16–22. Cf. Stanton, *Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii. 164.

temperament, in the later Pauline way as mainly a Spirit and a Church, he nevertheless believed that it was most important to produce a careful narrative of what Jesus of Nazareth did, and of His training of that "little flock" to whom, as he himself records, it was "the Father's good pleasure" to "give the kingdom" (Lk. xii. 32).

Here, then, three lines of argument appear to meet. It was said before that the three things which would most impress our Evangelist in the thought and conversation of his friend were: (1) the importance he attached to the fellowship of the brethren, i.e. his doctrine of the Church; (2) his reference of that presence of the Spirit, which underlay the fellowship, to earlier events, in the first instance to the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost, and so inevitably to Galilee, and, as I think, to Bethlehem; and (3) his expectation of a coming Day.

And now it seems that the lines meet. (1) It was S. Luke who came to know and was converted by S. Paul at the time when the great Apostle was hammering out under the stress of dividing controversy his doctrine of the one indivisible Church. It was S. Luke who went with him on his voyage to Rome, the centre of that now united world which was one day to be converted to the Church, and was with him in Rome (Col. iv. 14; Philemon 24) at about the time when he was elaborating, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, his doctrine of the Church. (2) It was S. Luke who had drunk so deeply of the Pauline spirit that he was eventually moved to write a book describing the coming of that Spirit and His action in the early Church. (3) It is S. Luke who shews how that action both verified and broadened the early Jewish expectations of a Messiah Who was to come.

And S. Luke is the author of a Gospel. The Christian disciple who is personally disposed to make so much of his membership of the Body, who regards the life of the Body as the continuous manifestation of the power and life of the divine Saviour, and the real fulfilment of the Apocalyptic Messianic promises, is found referring in Acts i. 1 to his former volume as one "concerning all that Jesus *began* both to do and to teach."

"Christ the Beginning, and the End is Christ." The ecclesiastically minded layman compiles a narrative of the words and

acts of Jesus. He was himself a Greek, and, among the ancients, something of a modern. He stood at what seemed to him perhaps the midday of the Christian faith. It was in reality but the "first hour" of a morning far longer than he dreamed of, a day of which the full noontide is still unutterably distant. But he harks back, for understanding and for inspiration, to that Apocalyptic dawn which rose so strangely in the mysterious bosom of the East. Not otherwise—the parallel is surely not altogether fanciful—does the devout Churchman live through the later hours of his Lord's "Day" on the strength of the strange and supernatural Bread that is given "very early in the morning." The rite itself was in its origin remote, Semitic, incomprehensible; the phraseology of its liturgical embodiment is sometimes difficult to modern ears. But it is real religion. It brings the divine touch to bear on earthly things.

PART II

THE PORTRAIT

CHAPTER V

THE CONTENTS OF THE GOSPEL

THE analysis by a modern critic of an ancient book is often vitiated by the fact that between the ancient and the modern there is a gulf of difference which it is hard for criticism to bridge over. But S. Luke is among the most modern of ancient writers, and it is possible to analyse his book, and then, with some degree of confidence, to ascertain his methods and to determine his motives. Here is a summary outline of the book as we have it, with a few notes on points of fact.

i. 1–4. The first four verses are the Preface, written in literary Greek. It is partly Preface, partly what we should now call Dedication. As Preface, it may be compared with the Prefaces commonly found in Greek historical writings. In so far as it was Dedication, it shews that the book was compiled with a specific purpose. S. Luke has no particular theory of his own inspiration[1]; he only claims to have made a careful and complete use of such evidence as was at his disposal. He was not himself an eye-witness, but he is in touch with those who were, and he has the further advantage of being able to build on the labours of various predecessors.[2] He is not concerned to prove what we call

[1] In fact he almost seems to disclaim divine inspiration. Contrast "it seemed good to me" (i. 3) with "it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us" (Acts, xv. 28). One reader at least has felt disturbed by this. The scribe of Codex b has added, in i. 3, "and to the Holy Ghost."

[2] The nature of S. Luke's sources in so far as they seem actually ascertainable is dealt with in chapters ix. and x. But since those can hardly be described as "many," a note on the point is demanded here. There were, no doubt, a number of attempts to write down portions of the current oral tradition. According to Blass (*Philol. of Gospels*, p. 15), *ἀνατάξασθαι* means "restore from memory." Why have they all perished, except S. Mark? Partly, no doubt, because they were fragmentary and so were superseded by the Gospels, which included and in value far surpassed them.

Some were perhaps heretical, or at least so inadequate as to be practically heretical. Perhaps they would have perished anyhow. The "Logia" which "Matthew composed in Hebrew" have perished. Q, which is perhaps to be identified with his Logia, defies and will probably continue to defy complete reconstruction. S. Mark's Gospel

the "historicity of Jesus." It was an unquestioned fact that Jesus had exercised a Ministry in Galilee, and the whole series of events which he proposes to describe is referred to as "the things which have been fulfilled amongst us." His object is to assure his aristocratic friend [1] that the spiritual movement, into which he had been gathered, had actually begun in the manner suggested in outline by his instructors. The main points of his friend's preparation for baptism had naturally been practical. It had been designed to produce conversion and to test his faith. There had been little opportunity for historical narrative. He and his friends were probably a good deal puzzled by the varied nature of the traditions which had reached them. But now the time had come to exhibit in some detail the Galilean basis on which the Church was built.

i. 5–ii. 52. To pass from verse 4 to verse 5 of the first chapter is like passing from Gibbon to the *Pilgrim's Progress*. The Preface is in the style of the professional historian; the remainder of the first two chapters is in the style of Genesis. The reason for this sudden change will be discussed later, but, speaking broadly, it is because he is about to describe a scene of old-fashioned rural piety.

The contents of the section are nearly all peculiar to S. Luke.[2] The announcement to Zacharias and Elizabeth of the birth of

nearly perished, as we can see from the fact that all our MSS. of it are descended from one single (mutilated) copy. The *Gospel according to the Hebrews* is known to us only from scattered references in S. Jerome, Origen, and Eusebius, and is generally thought to be of early date (perhaps before A.D. 100, and possibly as early as A.D. 65). Even if the earlier date be correct, it was probably not used by S. Luke. It was something like S. Matthew's Gospel, and the reason why the remainder of it has not survived is very likely the fact that its contents were largely the same as those of S. Matthew. The extant fragments contain some genuine traditions and some legendary matter.

[1] There seems little doubt that Theophilus was a real person, not a "gentle reader" like Bishop Christopher Wordsworth's *Theophilus Anglicanus*. It has been suggested that S. Luke was his freedman, and Sir W. M. Ramsay maintains that the use of the word κράτιστε proves that he was a Roman official of equestrian rank. In that case his baptismal name may have been used by S. Luke in order to avoid committing an official person to a connexion with the despised sect (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 388 n.). The addressee of the second-century Epistle to Diognetus, who is saluted, perhaps in imitation of S. Luke, as "most excellent Diognetus," is commonly thought to be a fictitious character.

[2] The Nativity Story in S. Matthew forms a most instructive contrast to that of S. Luke. The two are entirely different, and each is entirely characteristic of the writer. "In St. Matthew the Birth of Christ is connected with national glories: in St. Luke with pious hopes. . . . In St. Matthew we read of the Incarnation as it was revealed in a dream to Joseph, in whom may be seen an emblem of the ancient people; but in St. Luke the mystery is announced by the Mighty one of God to the Blessed Virgin, the type of the Christian Church. In St. Matthew the Nativity is ushered in

the forerunner is followed " in the sixth month " by the Annunciation to Mary. The Visitation, the Magnificat,[1] the birth and naming of John, and the Benedictus complete the first chapter. The Nativity, the story of the angels and the shepherds, the Circumcision and Presentation of the Holy Child, the episode of Simeon and Anna, the return to Nazareth and the story of the Child Jesus in the Temple are the materials of the second.

iii. 1–ix. 50.[2] This section deals with the appearance and career of S. John Baptist, with Our Lord's Baptism (here characteristically connected with the baptism of " all the people," and

by prophecy: in St. Luke it is heralded by those songs of triumphant faith which have been rehearsed in our public services for thirteen centuries. . . . In St. Matthew the Magi—the wise inquirers into the mysteries of the world—led by a strange portent in the sky, offer adoration and symbolic tribute to the new-born King of the Jews. In St. Luke the shepherds—the humble watchers of nature—the despised successors of the patriarchs—cheered by the voice of Angels, recognize and proclaim the praises of the Saviour of the meek in heart " (Westcott, *Introd. to Study of Gospels*, p. 317 f.). The only serious inconsistencies are that S. Matthew (ii. 23) appears to think that Joseph and Mary had not lived at Nazareth before, and that S. Luke says nothing of a flight to Egypt.

[1] In i. 46 three " European " Latin versions read " Elizabeth " for Mary. This was also the reading of Irenæus and of Niceta of Remesiana, the probable author of the Te Deum. It seems likely that both " Mary " and " Elizabeth " are glosses to explain an original ambiguous *καὶ εἶπεν*. The analogy of the LXX. suggests that *καὶ εἶπεν* may equally well introduce a continued utterance of the same speaker, or a reply by the other. Cp. (*a*) Lk. xxiv. 46 and (*b*) Lk. ii. 49. Prof. Burkitt argues that *αὐτῇ* in *v.* 56 must mean the speaker of the hymn; Bishop John Wordsworth that *v.* 48, " all generations shall call me blessed," is the natural answer to the ascription of blessedness to Mary in *v.* 45. On the whole the relative importance which S. Luke would be likely to assign to the two women seems best illustrated by regarding *vv.* 42–45 as the minor hymn of Elizabeth and the Magnificat as the major hymn of Mary. See the discussion (by Burkitt and Wordsworth) in Burn, *Niceta of Remesiana*, pp. cliii.–clviii.; also Burkitt in *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, Jan. 1906, 220 f.; C. W. Emmet, *The Eschatological Question*, etc., p. 175 f., where the point is made (p. 183) that " the only words in Hannah's song which are really appropriate to Elizabeth [i.e. 1 Sam. ii. 5b] are entirely unrepresented in the *Magnificat* "; Burn in *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*, s.v. *Magnificat*; Loisy, *Les Évangiles synoptiques*, i. 302–306.

[2] iii. 1 is a remarkable attempt to bring the Gospel history into relation with the history of the great Roman world. In the same spirit S. Luke calls Herod by his proper title of Tetrarch, not " king " (as Mk. vi. 14); he inserts in his parable of the Pounds (xix. 12, 14) an allusion to a journey made by Archelaus to Rome; he records (xiv. 31, 32) an illustration drawn from war and international diplomacy; he relates (xxiii. 2) the civil charge laid before Pilate; and in his account of Our Lord's trial he exonerates Pilate from blame much more than S. Mark does. With this may be compared his favourable picture of the Roman officials in Acts. Finally, as a travelled Greek, he does not call the Lake of Galilee a " sea."

The perplexing question of the " fifteenth year of Tiberius " is discussed by C. H. Turner, Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, art. " Chronology of the New Testament," and Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*. If the reign of Tiberius is reckoned from the death of Augustus (A.D. 14), it must be A.D. 28 or 29, both of which are unlikely. If the reign of Tiberius be reckoned from his earliest investment with certain specific powers, the fifteenth year may be as early as A.D. 25. For the supposed proof that S. Luke, in his reference to Lysanias, is following Josephus, see p. 229.

with mention of prayer), Genealogy,[1] and Temptation, and with the Ministry in Galilee. S. Luke, with his love for delineation and differentiation of character, is the only Evangelist who mentions the various classes of people who came (iii. 10 ff.) to receive baptism at the hands of John, and the counsel that he gave them.[2] Other incidents that are known to us only from this Gospel are the first sermon at Nazareth, with its dramatic end (iv. 16–30), the full story of the Call of Peter (v. 1–11), the raising of the widow's son at Nain (vii. 11–17), the anointing by the woman who was a sinner, with the parable of the two debtors (vii. 36–50), and the ministering women (viii. 1–3). The most important

[1] Why does S. Luke insert his genealogy after the Baptism? Dr. Moffatt (with particular reference to "the concluding editorial touch *Son of God*," and iii. 22) suggests that "he reserved this part of his source till he could prepare for it by the baptism at which Jesus, according to the primitive view, became *Son of God* (*Introd. to Lit. of New Testament*, p. 272). For the relation of the Baptism to the Sonship see below, p. 172. Even if the primitive view was as Dr. Moffatt suggests, the obvious reference to iii. 22 is quite enough to account for the place of the genealogy. It is a further explanation of "My beloved Son."

It has sometimes been contended that S. Luke's genealogy is that of Mary. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.*, i. 7), and other early writers assume that Mary was of the same tribe as Joseph, and that his descent and hers are therefore the same. But this is unproven and improbable. The genealogy of Luke may well have been compiled by some one who knew nothing of the Virgin Birth, and in any case Joseph was Our Lord's putative and legal "father." Both genealogies are certainly intended to be his. The differences are obvious. Matthew, who arranges the names in such a way as to make them easy to remember, traces the descent from Abraham, the father of the Jews, through Solomon, David, Jeconiah (= Jehoiachin), and Zerubbabel; Luke traces the ascent through Zerubbabel, Nathan, David, Abraham to Adam, the father of mankind. Matthew's genealogy is certainly defective and is generally considered to be artificial; the writer probably did not mean "begat" necessarily to imply physical parentage but only succession to the royal throne, and we may compare with this the practice of considering the issue of a "levirate" marriage (Deut. xxv. 5–10, Mt. xxii. 24; though in Ruth iv. 21 Obed is called the son of Boaz) to be the son of the deceased first husband. The absence of Jeconiah from Luke's list is perhaps to be explained by Jer. xxii. 30, but if so, the omission is not due to S. Luke; in a matter of this kind he would certainly follow some recognized list. What that was cannot now be determined. Mr. E. B. Nicholson suggests (see A. Wright, *S. Luke*, p. 24) that he "gives a list of names (imperfect) from the Bethlehem land-register of owners of Jesse's property." It seems probable that he reversed the order and added the names from Abraham to Adam (see Plummer, *Commentary*, p. 104, and Bacon in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, ii. 140a). There is no difficulty about the comparative poverty of a family claiming Davidic descent. Cp. the well-known story of Domitian and the two grandsons of Jude, the Lord's brother (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 20 and 32).

[2] The fact that in Mt. iii. 7 "offspring of vipers, who hath warned you," etc., is spoken to the Pharisees and Sadducees, in Lk. iii. 7 to the multitudes, is sometimes attributed to Matthew's tendency to severity towards the Jewish rulers, sometimes to the Lukan disposition to spare them; and sometimes to S. Luke's Greek detestation of "the rabble—the lower orders—the illiterate, noisy mischief-makers" (A. Wright, *Synopsis*, 2nd ed., p. 188). Cp. Lk. xi. 29 (Mt. xii. 38), Lk. xi. 15 (Mt. ix. 34, xii. 24), Lk. xii. 54 (Mt. xvi. 1). The last view is plausible but not easy to reconcile with other Lukan characteristics which will appear later.

paragraphs during this record of the Galilean Ministry (not, of course, peculiar to S. Luke) are the Choosing of the Twelve (vi. 12–16), the Sermon "on a level place," which corresponds roughly to S. Matthew's Sermon on the Mount (vi. 17–49), the message from the Baptist, and its sequel (vii. 18–35), S. Peter's Confession (ix. 18 f.), and the Transfiguration (ix. 28–36). In the main the Evangelist agrees with the Markan order, though he adds to it information which he has gathered from a source of his own and from another which he shares with S. Matthew. In one place he omits about a chapter and a half of S. Mark, an omission which must be considered later.

ix. 51–xix. 28. Much of the contents of this long section is peculiar to S. Luke.[1] In fact, the greater part of the section, ix. 51–xviii. 14, is commonly called the Great Interpolation. It used to be called the Peræan Ministry, because it was supposed to describe Our Lord's journey through Peræa. Peræa was that part of the territory of Herod Antipas which lay beyond or on the east side of Jordan, the land anciently called Gilead. This was the usual route of pilgrims from Galilee to Jerusalem, chosen in order to avoid passing through Samaria. But Professor Burkitt has shewn (*The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 96 n.) grounds for believing that Our Lord Himself, with James and John and perhaps others, went by way of Samaria, i.e. without crossing and recrossing the Jordan, and that Peter and others went by the ordinary Peræan route. If this was so, it explains (*a*) why the first incident of the section is the incident of James and John and the Samaritan village (cp. x. 33, xvii. 11, 16) and (*b*) why Peter is not mentioned in this section at all. There are, no doubt, a good many paragraphs which really belong to an earlier period of the Ministry, and are only recorded here because S. Luke had no note of their place and date, and inserted them in what seemed to him a convenient setting.[2]

[1] Only 35 verses out of 350 "contain any parallels to Mark either in substance or in phraseology" (Hawkins in *Oxford Studies*, p. 31). About half the section can be paralleled or illustrated from Mt., though the sequence, and the setting of the various sayings, are constantly different. It is only in relation to the Markan narrative that the section can properly be called the Great Interpolation.

[2] E.g. x. 38–42, xi. 14 ff., xi. 37 ff., xiii. 31 f., xiv. 1 ff., and no doubt others. Notes of time in this section are very vague. See ix. 51, 57, x. 1, 38, xi. 1, 5, 29, 37, xii. 1, 22, 54, xiii. 1, 10, 22, 31, xiv. 1, 25, etc. Burkitt suggests that "the greater part" of this section is misplaced (*Gospel History*, p. 208). But see Hawkins, *Oxford Studies*, p. 58.

In any case, the section describes the last journey to Jerusalem.[1] It begins with the solemn opening, "and it came to pass that when the days were being accomplished that he should be received up that he set his face to go towards Jerusalem" (ix. 51). It contains a great many of the most "Lukan" things, e.g. the rebuke to the fierceness of James and John (ix. 50–56), the Mission of the Seventy (x. 1 ff.),[2] their return (x. 17) and the strange passage about Satan fallen as lightning from heaven, the Good Samaritan (x. 25–37), Martha and Mary (x. 38–42), the Lord's Prayer in its Lukan version and its Lukan setting (xi. 1–4), the request to divide an inheritance and the parable of the Rich Fool (xii. 13–21), the parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin and the Lost Son (xv.), the Unrighteous Steward (xvi. 1–13), Dives and Lazarus (xvi. 19–31), the Ten Lepers (xvii. 11–19), the Poor

[1] Anyhow, it is intended to do so. Moffatt (*Introd.* p. 273) says bluntly: "ix. 51–xviii. 34 is not a travel-narrative; although it contains some incidents of travel (ix. 51–56, 57–62; x. 38 ff.; xiii. 22 f.; xiv. 25 f.; xvii. 11 f.), these do not dominate the general situation." The actual contents of the section appear to be an original travel source, on which there have been grafted, either by S. Luke or by some predecessor, a number of parables and sayings.

[2] There is a tradition that S. Luke was himself one of the Seventy; to this was subsequently added the further idea that S. Luke and S. Mark turned away at S. John vi. 66 and were brought back by S. Peter (Westcott, *Introd.* p. 234). The first part of this opinion appears to underlie the selection of the Gospel for S. Luke's Day in the Western Church (in the East, Lk. x. 16–21 is read). But if, as seems certain, S. Luke was a Gentile (see Col. iv. 10–14, and compare the mention of "barbarians" in Acts xxviii. 2, 4) he cannot possibly have been a disciple at this stage. Moreover, in his Preface he expressly distinguishes the first generation of "eye-witnesses" from that second generation to which he himself belonged. The same arguments are decisive against the truth of another tradition, that he was the unnamed disciple with Cleophas on the road to Emmaus (xxiv. 13). But it is likely enough that he was a proselyte, or one of the God-fearers who are so frequently mentioned in Acts. It is, moreover, very probable that he drew some of his material from one of the Seventy. Cp. ὑπηρέται (i. 2), a word not used of the Apostles. Eusebius, following Clement of Alexandria and other early writers, says that Barnabas, Barsabas who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias were among the Seventy. The qualifications credited to the two latter in Acts i. 22, 23 are such as to make this probable enough. It may be that Philip the Evangelist (see pp. 145 and 148) was one of them.

It is sometimes suggested that S. Luke describes the Mission of the Seventy as well as, and more fully than, of the Twelve, because seventy was the supposed number of the heathen nations. (See Gen. x. and cp. *Clement. Hom.* xviii. 4.) But the contents of the charge are thoroughly Jewish (see p. 91), and an alternative explanation of the choice of the number, if an explanation be required, is at hand in Num. xi. 16, or perhaps Gen. xlvi. 27. The Mission is sometimes condemned as unhistorical, but there is nothing inherently improbable in the belief that some number larger than twelve was sent out on such an errand as is described. It is the fact, however, that the contents of the two charges in Lk. ix. and x. are, roughly, the same as that of Mt. x. Hawkins suggests that ix. 57–62 may refer "to a sifting of the disciples preparatory to the appointment of so many of them to 'preach the kingdom of God'" (*Oxford Studies*, p. 57).

Widow and the Unjust Judge (xviii. 1–8), the Pharisee and the Publican (xviii. 9–14), and Zacchæus (xix. 1–10).

xix. 29–xxi. 38. This section contains the events of Sunday to Wednesday in Jerusalem. The story is closely parallel to that of S. Mark. The most notable Lukan addition is the moving incident of Our Lord weeping at the sight of the city (xix. 41–44).[1]

xxii.–xxiv. The Passion and Resurrection. Here the outline is identical with that of S. Mark, but it is used freely, and there are many differences.[2] The Last Supper[3] (xxii. 7–20) and the

[1] In xxi. 20, where Matthew and Mark have the phrase from Dan. ix. 27, "the abomination of desolation," Luke has "when ye see Jerusalem surrounded by armies." This was actually accomplished in A.D. 70, and the Lukan phraseology is often thought to have been coloured by the nature of the event. See p. 106 and the discussion of the date of the Gospel on p. 229 f.

One interesting, though not very important, group of MSS. (the "Ferrar" group) insert the passage about the woman taken in adultery (which appears in the ordinary text of Jn. vii. 53–viii. 11, though it quite certainly does not belong to that Gospel), after Lk. xxi. 38. There are in the passage certain Lukanisms of style, but the reason for its assignment to this place is probably the resemblance of the first three verses [S. John] vii. 53–viii. 2, to Lk. xxi. 37, 38. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39) remarks, on the authority of Papias, that the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" contained a story of "a woman accused of many sins before the Lord." It is most likely a genuine piece of tradition, excluded from the canonical Gospels because its treatment of sin was liable to be misunderstood.

[2] Sir John Hawkins finds on examining Lk. xxii. 14–xxiv. 10 that "Matthew adheres to Mark's language very nearly twice as closely as Luke does" (*Oxford Studies*, p. 78).

[3] The phrase in Lk. xxii. 27—"For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? Is not he that sitteth at meat? But I am among you as he that serveth"—is the sole equivalent in Luke, and indeed in the Synoptic Gospels, to the feet-washing of Jn. xiii.

There is an important variation in the text of this passage. The authority of the "Western" text is against verses 19b and 20. Dr. Stanton concludes (*Gospels*, etc., ii. 164) that "the truth probably is, not that the Western form must be the original one, but that the differences between it and the text of the best Greek MSS. go back to a very early time and that we have not sufficient evidence to enable us to decide between them." The important facts are that Mark, Matthew, and the shorter Lukan text omit the command to "do this." The shorter Lukan text is thus independent of 1 Cor. xi. in this respect, though it agrees with 1 Cor. x. 16 in mentioning the Cup before the Bread (cp. *Didache*, 9). These facts, and the further circumstance that the word "new" occurs only in 1 Cor. xi and the longer Lukan form, have suggested to some critics that Our Lord did not at this time institute a rite which was intended to be repeated. Against this there is (1) the evidence of Deissmann (*Light from the Ancient East*, p. 341) that διαθήκη in Hellenistic Greek can only mean "testament." Now a testament is clearly something that is to be used after death. And if it be urged that it is impossible altogether to evacuate from the LXX. meaning of the word the sense of a bilateral "covenant," it appears that the Old Testament passages here referred to (Exod. xxiv. 6–8 and perhaps Jer. xxxi. [LXX. xxxviii.] 31, διαθήκην καινήν) are certainly inaugural of a new state of things. (2) There is much to be said for the view that the feeding of the five thousand was the first inauguration of something which typified and anticipated the Messianic feast. See Is. xxv. 6; Prov. ix. 5; Ecclus. xxiv. 19 f; and Jn. vi., and note on p. 77. The newness of the Supper would in that case lie in the connexion then made with the Lord's Death, which Death was subsequently

Agony [1] in the Garden and the Arrest (xxii. 39–53) are related more fully, and among new features are the Trial before Herod (xxiii. 6–12) and the story, told with Lukan irony, of its surprising result (12), the episode of the daughters of Jerusalem (xxiii. 27–31), the two Robbers (xxiii. 39–43), three of the seven words from the Cross, and several of the incidents of the Resurrection.[2] The

interpreted by the Resurrection. And not only subsequently. It seems certain that Our Lord at the Supper thought of His approaching Death as a releasing of redemptive forces, and that He anticipated a coming state of glory which was also somehow connected with the present meal—"until that day when I shall drink it new in the kingdom of God" (Mk. xiv. 25; cf. Mt. xxvi. 29; Lk. xxii. 18). Some may find it difficult to trust the verbal accuracy of the Gospel sayings like "and on the third day shall rise again," because it was so easy for the Evangelists thus to complete from their own knowledge the three predictions of the Passion, but it is much more difficult to deny that Our Lord knew that His Death would be in some way effective. We cannot say for certain that He foresaw the Day of Pentecost, the Catholic Church, or even His own Resurrection, *exactly as they subsequently came to pass*, because in all these matters He was content to be in the Father's hands. But we can say for certain that the solemn ritual of the upper room on that tragic night was for Him possessed and transfigured by an anticipation of coming Triumph. (3) It is very difficult to imagine that the disciples did not know what the Master had wished. We know that as a matter of fact they did subsequently continue to break bread together and, further, that a presence of the Risen Master was in some way made known to them on the occasions of their doing so. Yet they connect this practice and this experience with the Last Supper. On the hypothesis that the real origin of the Eucharist, as a Church rite, is to be sought rather in Apostolic experience than in the events of the Upper Room we are led to the improbable conclusion that the Church consistently and confidently antedated the moment at which the Lord had revealed to them His will in the matter, and yet abstained from adding to the Synoptic narrative the single word "ποιεῖτε," which would have completely justified their practice. Finally (4) there is S. Paul, who is earlier than any of the Gospels. His "I received from the Lord" in 1 Cor. xi. 23 must indicate, at least in part, the same process as that of the Resurrection tradition in 1 Cor. xv. 3, "I received." "The preposition may quite properly be taken to describe the ultimate, and not the immediate, source of the information" (Anderson Scott in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 337). "He means, of course, through those who had delivered to him the Lord's commandments" (Stanton, *Gospels*, ii. 165 n.). The *significance* of the Eucharist was no doubt made known to him by the Lord Himself, perhaps in the course of such experiences as those referred to in 2 Cor. xii. 1–4, 9, perhaps as a result of repeated acts of participation in the breaking and receiving of the Bread. But the *facts* of the Upper Room, as here summarized, can only have reached him from one or more of those who had been present. S. Paul was watched by critics and even antagonists, who were perpetually on the look-out for indication on his part of some damning divergence from Apostolic practice; he was himself actually accustomed to think more of the heavenly than of the Galilean Christ. It is wholly incredible that he could have invented and foisted upon the Church the practice of a rite which nevertheless came to be universally and unquestioningly accepted as the fulfilment of a Dominical command.

[1] xxii. 43, 44 are perhaps not part of the genuine text of S. Luke.

[2] It must be observed that S. Luke's narrative does not by itself constitute the ground on which Christians believe in the Resurrection. Nor was it ever intended to do so. Also it is to be noted that neither S. Luke nor any other of the Evangelists describes the Resurrection itself. Contrast the fanciful story of the second-century *Gospel of Peter*: "And in the night when the Lord's day was drawing on, as the soldiers were on guard . . . there was a great voice in heaven, and they saw the heavens opened and two men descend thence with great radiance, and they stood over the tomb. But

most considerable of these incidents is the walk to Emmaus, but there may also be noted the fact of an appearance to Simon (xxiv. 34; cp. 1 Cor. xv. 5),[1] the "Handle me and see,"[2] the eating of a piece of broiled fish (43)[3]; the exposition of Moses, the prophets, and the Psalms; the "promise of the Father," and the injunction to the disciples to wait in the city till they should be endued with power from on high (44–49). The scene of the Resurrection appearances mentioned by S. Luke is the

that stone which had been cast at the door rolled away of itself and withdrew to one side, and the tomb was opened, and both the young men entered . . . again they behold three men coming out of the tomb, and two of them were supporting the third, and a cross was following them: and the heads of the two men reached to the heavens, but the head of Him Who was being led along by them was higher than the heavens [cf. Wisdom, xviii. 16]. And they heard a voice from heaven which said, Hast thou preached to them which are asleep? And a response was heard from the cross, Yea" (tr. by Rendel Harris). The *Gospel of Peter* even knows the name of the centurion, Petronius, a name clearly derived from the "stone" of the sepulchre, just as the legendary name of the soldier at the Cross is Longinus (λόγχη, Jn. xix. 34). A Christian interpolation in the *Ascension of Isaiah* goes further and speaks of "the descent of the angel of the Church which is in heaven" and invents a prediction that "the angel of the Holy Spirit and Michael the Chief of the holy angels on the third day will open the tomb, and His Beloved come forth seated on their shoulders" (iii. 15 f.). A Coptic book of the latter half of the second century introduces Martha and Mary, with other legendary details, including a quotation by Our Lord of Wisdom xviii. 17.

[1] Origen conjectures that Peter was one of the two disciples going to Emmaus. In that case we should have to conclude that Lk. xxiv. 34 should read (as Codex Bezæ does) "they found the eleven . . . and said," λέγοντες for λέγοντας.

[2] Ignatius (*Ad Smyrn.* 3) quotes the substance of xxiv. 38, 39 in a slightly different form: "Take, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal demon [δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον]; and straightway they touched him, and believed, being joined with [lit. mixed with] his flesh and his spirit." The actual source of the particular expression "incorporeal demon" is said by Jerome (*De. Vir. ill.* 2 and elsewhere) to be the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, though Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39) does not know the source of the incident, and Origen (*De Princ., præf.* 8) assigns it to a document called *Doctrina Petri*. The point is that, whether Ignatius took it from tradition or from a written source, the language of the canonical Gospels has begun already to be elaborated. See Lightfoot, *ad loc.* The wording of Ignatius has possibly been affected by Eucharistic associations.

[3] Contrast Tobit xii. 19. If the incident be really historical, its purpose must have been to reassure. It seems impossible that the Risen Lord can have needed either food or sleep or habitation. All that can be said is that He *may* have taken food in order to convince the disciples that His present mode of existence was continuous with what they had known before. S. Luke's object is no doubt to assert the reality of the Resurrection. Canon V. F. Storr (*Christianity and Immortality*, p. 88, following an article by Rev. R. Vaughan in the *Church Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1916) has some very interesting suggestions. "We must assume that when He took the food into His hands He changed its substance so that it could be assimilated by His spiritual body. If we keep steadily in mind the spiritual origin of matter, and remember that matter owes at each moment its continuance to spirit, it ceases to be incredible that at Christ's touch the food should become spiritualized. If food can become spirit, if there is one unbroken process of transformation from the initial stage of digestion to the activities of mind and will, it is not impossible to believe that one possessed of Christ's control of matter could convert the food at once into the spirit which it had in it the capacity ultimately to become."

city of Jerusalem. He "foreshortens the history" (Swete), and has no space for the Galilean events of S. Matthew (the lost end of S. Mark), and Jn. xxi. The traditional period of forty days (Acts i. 3) leaves time for both,[1] but one of the results of the Lukan selection of events is that for S. Matthew's "that they go unto Galilee, and there shall they see me" (xxviii. 10; cp. 16, 17), which was no doubt also in the lost ending of S. Mark (see xvi. 7), he has "Remember how he spake unto you while he was yet in Galilee" (xxiv. 6). The times indicated in the Gospel are apparently the beginning and the end of the whole period. Thus, it is clear that everything down to xxiv. 43 happened on the first Sunday, and for the remaining incidents Dr. Swete supposes that Luke xxiv. 44–46 or 47 belongs to the Sunday before the Ascension and the rest to the day of the Ascension.[2] Finally, S. Luke alone of the Evangelists records the Ascension.

As a matter of fact, it has been maintained that S. Luke does not record the Ascension. "The Ascension," says Dr. Hort (*The New Testament in the Original Greek*, vol. ii. App., p. 73), "apparently did not lie within the proper scope of the Gospels, as seen in their genuine texts; its true place was at the head of the Acts of the Apostles, as the preparation for the Day of Pentecost, and thus the beginning of the history of the Church." The reference to "genuine texts" takes for granted that the marginal reading of the Revised Version of Lk. xxiv. 51, which omits "and was carried up into heaven," is correct. But even so, it is probable that the solemn "parted from them" and the return of the disciples "with great joy" indicate something which they perceived to be a final separation. In all probability S. Luke intended at the end of his Gospel to mention briefly the fact of the Ascension, reserving the detailed story for the opening of his second book. At any rate, as Dr. Plummer points out, he claims in Acts i. 1, 2 to have recorded in his previous volume the things that Jesus began to do and to teach "until the day when he was taken up." And it may well be that at the earlier date he did not know the whole story. His notes of time in verses 44, 46 are vagueness itself. It is not necessary to suppose with some critics

[1] The actual distance from Jerusalem to Capernaum was about eighty miles as the crow flies.

[2] *Appearances of Our Lord after the Passion*, p. 93.

that he means to suggest that the Resurrection and the Ascension took place on the same day,[1] but it is true that the account in the Gospel is silent about the forty days of Acts i. 3, during which He spoke to the disciples of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.

[1] Ep. Barn., xv. 9 is often referred to in this connexion: "We keep the eighth day for rejoicing, on which Jesus both rose from the dead and having been manifested ascended into heaven." This need only mean that the author supposes that the Ascension occurred on a Sunday. See Swete, *The Apostles' Creed*, pp. 64–70. With regard to the "forty days" of Acts, if we could accept the theory of Dr. Chase, that Acts was written first, the Gospel account would be a summary mention of an incident already described at length.

CHAPTER VI

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL

We have seen something of the previous history, the environment, and the habit of mind of the Evangelist. And we have noted summarily the contents of his book. We may now begin to examine it more closely. How far may we believe the story that it contains?

I have no intention of attempting to prove in detail *ab initio* the historicity of the received story of Our Lord's earthly life. Reference has already been made to the Mythological school and to the nine "foundation pillars."[1] No one need hesitate to reject the vagaries of the former and to build with generous though always scientific freedom on the latter.[2]

But the principal argument for the general historical truth of the Gospels is the existence of Christianity. Thus one real reason for believing that Our Lord rose from the dead is the fact of the Church. S. Luke's Resurrection narrative does not prove it. It was never meant to do so. In fact, apart from his mention of the

[1] See above, p. 33.

[2] It is true that the Fourth Evangelist, wishing to kill the absurd theory of certain Docetists that it was Simon of Cyrene who really died on the Cross instead of the Saviour (for whom suffering and death were unthinkable), does so by eliminating Simon from his narrative and saying (xix. 17) that "Jesus went forth carrying the cross *for himself*." It is true that he meets the claims of those who in his day assigned an overgreat importance to the Baptist, by emphasizing more than the Synoptists and more than is at all probable historically the Baptist's recognition of Our Lord's Person and Office. These things are warnings against supposing that the Evangelists treated history in the modern way. I do not suggest that S. Luke claims anything like the same right to restate and interpret facts, but, to take one example, the divergence in his three accounts of S. Paul's conversion (Acts ix., xxii., xxvi.) shews that he assumes a certain liberty in presenting his story. What we have in his Gospel is a substantially true history, to which is added the inestimable boon of the impression made by the life of Jesus on his mind. When it is remembered that we have at hand S. Mark's Gospel, with its more photographic method and its clearer delineation of the stages in the Ministry, and that this does enable us to some extent to go behind S. Luke, I am disposed to think that, whatever be the exact degree of interpretation in S. Luke's Gospel, it is a gain much more than a loss.

appearance to Peter and the Emmaus incident, his narrative is not by itself very convincing. Parts of it (e.g. xxiv. 41–43) may even be unhistorical; and the record may depend on some popular tradition that reached the Evangelist and was accepted by him because he argued that the Lord must surely have proved somehow that He was not a phantom. But these things hardly affect the truth of the Lukan portrait. The fact that Christianity began, and has continued, to exist, proves incontestably that a certain very piercing impression was made in the first century of our era on Palestinian Judaism, and subsequently on the world at large.

The results of that impression are known to us. In fact, we ourselves are one of them. And the causes—a coherent, reasonable, and adequate series of causes—are provided by the events recorded in the Gospels.

The assumption that some such events as those really happened gives us—what no counter-theory can pretend to give—a *vera causa* for the subsequent history of the world. As Professor Burkitt has said, "There is one thing at least which we know before we start. We know that the events of the first century produced the second and succeeding centuries. There is no need for the most timid to be afraid of the results of historical investigation. We know the result of the events beforehand; the investigations of the critics cannot alter the events of past history." [1]

Nor need the fact that many of the events are miraculous detain us long. And that for two reasons. First, because we are no longer in the eighteenth century. At that time on the one hand it was supposed by many that a story containing miracles, if not actually an indication of *mala fides* on the part of the writer, could anyhow be dismissed at once. On the other hand Christianity was sometimes defended on the ground that the evidence in favour of its miracles was well up to the legal standard and was accordingly sufficient to establish the truth of the religion. Secondly, because we are no longer in the nineteenth century, when, in the first enthusiasm of certain newly realized and overwidely dominating conceptions, it was supposed that the universe was made for law and not law for the universe.

[1] *The Gospel History*, etc., p. 32.

From this accident of birth there proceed two results. We no longer, with Paley, attempt to prove Christianity on the evidence of its miracles; we have, in fact, reversed the process. And, in the second place, the discussions which took place forty or fifty years ago on the *a priori* possibility of miracle have been replaced by consideration of the "creative" nature of evolution or, in more definitely theological language, of the freedom of God. It has become much easier to believe in miracles, but on the other hand Christians attach less importance to them, and are prepared to believe that some other name may presently be found for them. But those who believe the Catholic Faith and also appreciate the historical importance of the early phenomena of Christianity as it comes before us, say at Corinth in the middle of the first century, have no difficulty in coming to two conclusions:

(1) The despair into which the disciples of Jesus had been plunged by the Crucifixion was quickly changed to a condition of happy faith which is only to be explained by believing that their Master had really risen from the dead. Compare, for example, Lk. xxii. 54–63 with Acts ii. 36–39, iv. 10–13, v. 29, xv. 28, etc.

(2) The spiritual exaltation of the early Christians and the discernment which they unquestionably possessed of the veritable, eternal truth of God were accompanied by a remarkable control over human bodies and perhaps other material things.

Everything else is comparatively unimportant. If it be allowed that Our Lord was God Incarnate, that He rose from the dead, and that His Spirit gave to the members of His Church a power of affecting their material environment which is akin to that attributed in the Gospels to Himself, we may confidently leave the historicity of the specific miracles of the Gospels to be determined by the advancing knowledge of the future. Dr. Sanday quotes a remark of Schweitzer to the effect that he is disposed simply to leave the miraculous incidents in the Gospels "with a note of interrogation." Dr. Sanday himself would place the note of interrogation "in brackets and in the margin."[1] The interrogation, whether bracketed or unbracketed, whether in text or margin, is a necessary tribute to the difference between the ways in which an event would naturally be recorded by a

[1] *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 103.

typical observer of the first century and another of the twentieth. There is a difference, and the question to be decided is—how great exactly is it? If, for example, a "rationalizing" explanation of the feeding of the five thousand [1] is really more probable than the explanation generally received among orthodox Christians, by all means let us accept it. Let us be fully conscious of the simple faith which led S. Luke to accept without any kind of philosophic hesitation the traditions that Jesus had raised the widow's son and the daughter of Jairus. But if we nevertheless believe that Jesus is one to whom such operations are normal and natural,[2] that "the Lord of all good life" could hardly be manifested among men without affecting His environment in some such ways as these, let us not stumble at the fact that the narrative is miraculous. The ordinary canons of historical probability must be applied, as far as we are competent to apply them, to all the narratives, "miraculous" and "non-miraculous" alike.[3]

We pass, therefore, from these philosophical matters to the historical question—How far may the Gospel of S. Luke be considered to be a real portrait? And here may I give two warnings? The actual accounts contained in all four Gospels of Our Lord's words and deeds represent only a fraction of what He

[1] Perhaps I ought really to say "religious" rather than "rationalizing." It may be that the real purpose of the distribution was what we should call "religious," that it was more like Holy Communion than a regular meal, and the portions distributed were accordingly very small. One of the traditional features of the expected Kingdom of God was the Messianic feast, and it appears from a comparison of Mk. vi. 45 (= Mt. xiv. 22) with Jn. vi. 15 that such an interpretation of the feeding was made by the multitude and some of its consequences were deprecated by Our Lord. In any case, it is held by many critics that the Last Supper presupposes some such anticipation of its Messianic significance as is here suggested. For the Messianic feast Schweitzer (*Quest*, p. 377) refers to Is. lv. 1 f., lxv. 13 f., xxv. 6–8; Enoch xxiv., xxv., lxii. 14; Mt. viii. 11, 12, xxii. 1–14, xxv. 1–13; Apoc. ii. 7, 17, iii. 21, vii. 16, 17. Cp. Lk. xxii. 18, 29.

[2] The point that Our Lord's miracles are restorations of a broken order is made by Dr. Gore in his *Bampton Lectures* (Lect. II).

[3] The difficulty of returning a consistently negative answer is illustrated by Mr. Montefiore's comment on Lk. vii. 11–17: "The story is clearly based upon the stories of Elijah and Elisha in 1 Kings xvii. 17–24 and 2 Kings iv. 33–37. Almost each detail in the Elisha story finds its parallel here. The rest is taken from other stories—the daughter of Jairus, the healing of the paralytic, and so on. It must be admitted that the number of these parallels speak for the invention of the tale by the Evangelist. But how came he to think of putting the scene of the story at Nain? Why should he have deliberately chosen this particular place, unless there was at least some record or tradition that at Nain Jesus had worked a stupendous miracle?" (*Synoptic Gospels*, ii, p. 897). Mr. Montefiore does not mean to suggest that the miracle was actually performed, but the reader is irresistibly reminded of Blougram's "Just when we are safest, there's a sunset touch."

said and did. S. Luke refers (iv. 23) to things done at Capernaum, and (x. 13) to mighty works wrought at Chorazin and Bethsaida, which he has not described.[1] And S. John says (xxi. 25) that if all the other things which Jesus did were written every one, "not even the world itself would contain the books that should be written." The Gospels are not a complete record, but an impression. The contents of them are not a tithe of the whole activity of the Lord's Ministry. But the events which are written are written for our admonition, and by the grace of God they are enough. And the fact that there are four records, each surveying the central Figure from its own point of view, and that these records are broadly comprehensible and have in fact been comprehended into the Christ-picture of the Church, is a further proof that the Gospels are impressions, and that an impressionist method was the proper and indeed the only practicable method.

Secondly, let it be noted that while I from time to time point out respects in which S. Luke differs from the other Evangelists, and from such of his peculiarities as seem to be significant I do not hesitate to draw conclusions about his intellectual and spiritual stature, I do not propose to confine myself to points which are peculiar to S. Luke. The result of doing so would be a calamity. For this might mean that many features which are entirely characteristic of the Third Evangelist, an essential part of the material for a complete appraisement of his Gospel, would be omitted. Points which he took from sources which we know may be just as characteristic as the points which he took from sources that we do not know. It is impossible to say that S. Luke did not read S. Mark with just as much enthusiasm as any of his other sources, or that the sayings of his Master reported in the document called Q, and thus used by S. Matthew as well as by himself, did not kindle his devotion and renew his faith as much as any for which he may have been indebted to special sources like Joanna the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, or to Mary the mother of Our Lord herself. It will be the aim of the chapters that follow to see his Gospel steadily and to see it whole. I shall not, therefore, think it necessary to omit from consideration all characteristics that S. Luke shares with others. And the

[1] Cp. also xiii. 34, "How many times!"

bearing of this on the question of his historical credibility is obvious. If it appear that he has used with free but reasonable loyalty his known Markan source and another which can at least be partly identified, it is likely that he used his other sources, if with equal freedom, yet with equal faithfulness.

It is supremely important to understand that all the Gospels arose in an already Christian atmosphere, and represent an attempt to satisfy those who were already Christians. Without the knowledge of this fact they remain an inscrutable enigma. In the case of S. Luke's Gospel the fact is quite obvious. The book is dedicated, as we should say, to one Theophilus, who was a Christian and had already been catechized.[1] The object of the book is to enable him to know the certainty of that which had been orally imparted. It cannot be understood too clearly that whether we assign, with Harnack, an early date to S. Luke, or with other scholars the later date, S. Paul's Epistles were already written, and Christianity had been established in many parts of the Mediterranean world for a number of years.

Before the Gospels had been written, the Church subsisted on the memories of eye-witnesses, on oral tradition, on a collection of the Lord's sayings, and on Epistles. This was the sum-total; of this no local Church had more than a part. S. Mark perceived the danger that the Church might be content to rely merely on the theology of preachers and Epistle-writers and on that bare record, if such indeed it was, of select sayings of the Master which we commonly call Q. He conceived the great and (as far as we know) original design of a Gospel, a fairly complete if brief and summary Gospel, a means of recovering, before they receded altogether from the memory of man, the earthly lineaments of that wonderful life.

On this subject Mr. Lacey writes :

> What is the purpose of this human document [S. Mark's Gospel]? I have a suggestion to offer. It is that St. Paul's Gospel, the primitive Gospel, was found in practice to make for an imperfect apprehension of the real manhood of Jesus Christ. You know the tendency of all Christian ages . . . to convert the Incarnation into a pure theophany. I suggest that

[1] i. 4. κατηχήθης. See, however, p. 124.

St. Paul's teaching about the coming of the Son of God to the death of the Cross, and his neglect of the sayings and doings of Jesus,[1] were being exaggerated in this fashion; that consequently the intimate follower of St. Peter was moved to put on record incidents which illustrated and emphasized the real humanity of the Master.

Whether I have gauged his purpose correctly or not, this is in fact what he did. He portrayed Jesus in his habit as he lived. It is amazing that such a portraiture was possible, that after so many years of developed teaching about the Christ, disciples were able to put on record memories of the Master's life and conversation almost untouched by anything which they had subsequently come to understand in his personality. The record is on this account the more convincing. And its value for us exceeds all calculation. . . . It is for us in practical truth the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. But I remind you that this is not the primitive Gospel. You cannot start from this and make the teaching of St. Paul a later development. The Gospel of St. Paul came first: the Synoptic tradition came later. It was in effect, if not in purpose, a necessary correction of a possible misunderstanding (*The Historic Christ*, pp. 61–63).

A quite different view is put forward by the writers of Essay IV in *Foundations*: "The effect of 'Paulinism' was not to destroy men's interest in the earthly life and Passion of the Lord, but rather to stimulate it; to this fact it may be that we owe the existence of S. Mark's Gospel. It is curious to observe that the critical school which has insisted most strongly upon the alleged indifference of S. Paul to the 'Jesus of history' has also been the most quick to discover in S. Mark the operation of a 'Pauline tendency'" (p. 188 n.).

I cannot doubt that Mr. Lacey is nearer the truth. The question is complicated by the difficulty of ascertaining how far the Docetism[2] and the resolution of Christianity into a non-historical mysticism, which were undoubtedly great dangers in the second century, are also to be assumed in the first century. It is certain that the Gospel and First Epistle of S. John are anti-Docetic, and at least as far as concerns the *acceptance* of the Gospels it seems right to conclude, with Professor Burkitt, that "the part played by Docetic theories of Our Lord's nature and

[1] A neglect which Mr. Lacey appears to overestimate a little.

[2] Docetism is the view, to us fantastic, but not uncommon in early days, that Our Lord's Humanity, and especially His Death, was only an appearance (δοκεῖν). It is based upon the idea that God does not express Himself in matter, and, above all, cannot suffer.

person had a determining influence upon the official preservation of the Gospel History." "The Gospels that we have would never have become the official charters of the Church, but for the theological necessity of insisting upon the true humanity of Our Lord" (*Gospel History*, pp. 274, 287).

S. Luke evidently shared the opinion that a Gospel was a desirable accession to the equipment of the Church. But he also wished to emphasize an element of Christianity which appealed with special force to him, an element which will be described in greater detail hereafter. He wished to depict the kind of Christ in Whom he had himself learned to believe. It would no doubt be possible to assert that he determined at all costs to attribute to Our Lord his own personal notion of Christianity, to Paulinize and Lukanize the Master. I am myself quite sure that he had no such intention.[1] His motive in writing was the motive of giving chapter and verse to his friend Theophilus and others like him. His method was the method of using all the best authorities within his reach. I do not think that his motive was anywhere a wish, or even willingness, to invent suitable or congenial things, or that his method was anywhere, except in a few instances, a method of considering within himself what might most naturally be supposed to have occurred. And yet he writes, as I say, quite definitely as a Christian, to Christians, about things which only a Christian is likely to appreciate or understand. *What difference does this attitude make to his Gospel?*

In the work of criticizing the early literature of Christianity, the completely critical position is only possible to those who are Christians. I actually mean that those who are not Christians are at a critical disadvantage. They have something less than

[1] "One of the most assured results of recent research is that he was not a Paulinist masquerading as an historian" (Moffatt, *Introd. to Lit. of New Testament*, p. 281). Dr. Moffatt quotes Jülicher, Wellhausen, B. Weiss, and others to the same effect. It must be remembered that "Paulinist" is here used in a special, technical sense. In that sense it is really very doubtful whether there ever was such a thing as Paulinism at all, at least until the time of Marcion. See Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, p. 142, and Lake, *Earlier Epistles*, pp. 423–424; Dr. Anderson Scott in *Camb. Bibl. Essays*, pp. 334–335; A. B. Bruce, *With Open Face*, pp. 55–56. In a more general sense of the word Harnack has no hesitation in describing S. Luke as a Paulinist. Cp. Schmiedel in *Encycl. Bibl.*, ii. 1840: "The very widely accepted view that Luke is of a specifically Pauline character can be maintained only in a very limited sense." Loisy even says: "Il ne s'intéresse pas à la théologie particulière de saint Paul, et l'on dirait presque qu'il l'ignore" (*Les Évangiles synoptiques*, i. p. 173).

the complete equipment. They lack one item of the complete critical apparatus. For a complete criticism is one that takes account of all the facts. And non-Christians do not appreciate that to which the Christian origins have actually led. They cannot survey all the facts, because there is one leading fact, the super-fact, which they have passed over. They examine the origins of Christianity, but they have omitted to take into consideration the present existence of the Church. They are therefore critically deficient.

The critics whom I am here accusing would probably reply that my own churchmanship gives me a bias in the traditional direction. And indeed, inasmuch as Christian theology does consist, strictly speaking, of the investigation of Christianity by Christians, a bias which is founded on actual experience and is anxious to take into consideration the experience of previous generations of Christians, is a good and true bias to have. To understand consists not in the apprehension of isolated facts, but in the comprehension and co-ordination of facts into a scheme. Christian theologians need common honesty and truthfulness as much as anybody, but there is a quality of sympathy without which it is more difficult to arrive at truth. The criticism described by its exponents as "thoroughgoing" is a useful exercise and a salutary object-lesson. But better is that criticism which is not only thoroughgoing but complete.

This is not merely a digression. My point is that S. Luke was equipped for his study of Christian origins in what I have called the complete way. He approached it with the kind of sympathy which is likely to lead to the ascertaining of the truth. How far did his position as a Churchman assist him in his work as an historian?

1. I think it must be admitted that in one respect his position may have given him a distorted view. He was undoubtedly what we should call a truthful person, but it cannot be pretended that he had the scientific zeal of the best modern historians. He took pains to ascertain facts, but he was not alive to some of the perils that surround historical inquiry.

The extent of his failure has been grossly exaggerated. He was not an eye-witness of the events which he describes in his

Gospel, and he was not a "realist," in the modern sense of one who particularly delights to record unpleasing things.[1] He omitted, and here and there he altered, things which he thought unedifying.[2] He may have occasionally confused two events of like kind.[3] Physician though he was, he was uncritical about miracle.[4] There is probably an imaginative element in his account of the Nativity. That is all. The view that he wrote his Gospel or the Acts with the intention of enveloping the life of Our Lord or the early years of the Church with a glamour of agreeable invention, that he recklessly imagined scenes which he had no reason to believe had ever taken place, that he disarmed controversialists and resolved their controversies by the expedient

[1] That he was a realist in the better sense of the word is surely indicated by passages like vii. 11–17, xiv. 1–6, 7–11, xvii. 11–19, xxi. 37, 38, xxiii. 9, 10, xxiv. 13–32. As far as concerns what is called his "eirenic" tendency, the impression produced by a comparison of the two books is that this tendency is more apparent in the Acts than in the Gospel, though even in Acts it has been greatly exaggerated. For example, his account of the Council of Jerusalem in Acts xv., which was formerly considered by many critics to be a serious glossing over of a deep-seated divergence, is much more easily regarded as in the main trustworthy now that the "Western" reading of xv. 20, 28 and xxi. 25 is beginning to be accepted as probable. See, for a discussion of this, Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 48 ff. It remains true, to take one more example, that he nowhere describes the withstanding of S. Peter by S. Paul which is alluded to in Gal. ii. 11. But it must be remembered that even S. Paul only alludes to it once, and that this single mention is wrung from him in the heat of controversy. S. Luke, if we assume that he knew the incident, which is not certain, may well have considered that anyhow it was safely over and done with, and that it was not one of the steps in the gradual building-up of the Church with which he was concerned. In the same way he omits, in the Gospel, the rebuke of S. Peter's presumption (Mk. viii. 33) and the ambitious request of James and John (Mk. x. 35 ff.). The quarrel with Barnabas, which he does relate, had more of a missionary result.

It must be added that the impression referred to above is perhaps to be discounted by the fact that in the case of the Gospel we have no such vivid, independent, and unconscious testimony as is provided for Acts by the Epistles of S. Paul. S. Mark's Gospel is indeed available for comparison, but it does not provide so searching a test of accuracy as the actual contemporary correspondence of the chief actor in the events.

[2] See below, pp. 132, 133.

[3] See p. 86, n. 1.

[4] Dr. P. Gardner speaks, apropos of Lk. xxiv. 39 and 43 and Acts ii. 1–4, vii. 56, ix. 3, 4, of the Evangelist's "resolute materialism" (*Religious Experience of St. Paul*, p. 7). This is rather in the severe nineteenth-century vein, though it may readily be conceded that S. Paul's attitude towards the miraculous is much truer than S. Luke's. Dr. Gardner has even gone so far as to say (*Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 390) that he "loves a good miracle," and suggests (with Harnack) that he "was attracted to the new faith by its power over disease and evil spirits" (*ibid.* p. 386; cp. *Luke the Physician*, pp. 176, 187, 195). This may be so, though in Acts xiv. 19, 20, and perhaps xx. 10, he abstains from pointing a miraculous moral where it would have been quite easy to do so. And cp. x. 20 ("Rejoice not that the spirits are subject to you, but rejoice that your names are written in the heavens"). It was this passage which Gregory quoted to Augustine when the latter had written rather boastfully of the miracles accomplished by him at Canterbury. See Bede, *Eccl. Hist.* i. 31.

of diverting attention to a charming narrative about something else, is one which has no foundation.

An interesting example of the oversubtlety with which S. Luke can be treated is to be found in Professor Schmiedel's criticism[1] of the account of the Call of Peter in chapter v. "It constitutes," he says, following Lipsius and other critics, "one of the few examples we have in the Synoptists of a consciously framed allegory being put forward in the form of a seemingly historical narrative, in order to set forth a particular idea; this idea is in point of fact quite clear." The professor goes on to argue as follows: The passage (v. 1–11) is evidently a substitute for the brief account of the call of Peter in S. Mark. The function of fishers of men is teaching. *The story is therefore a parable*, like the parable of the drag-net in Mt. xiii. 47. "Simon with his comrades has toiled in vain the whole night through; now, on receiving a special command from Jesus, he makes an unexpected haul." This refers to "the practically fruitless mission to the Jews, and the highly successful mission to the Gentiles. In the latter Peter received a special divine command, and this was necessary in order to overcome his original aversion to such an undertaking (Acts x. 9–22, the story of Cornelius). The launching forth into the deep also will admit of being interpreted as referring to missions to heathen lands as compared with the less venturesome putting out a little from the shore, although it is not said that the fruitlessness of the night's toil is caused by the proximity to the shore. The sin of which Peter becomes suddenly conscious (v. 8) is thus by no means sinfulness in general—*reference to this were but little called for by the circumstances*—but definitely the sin of failure hitherto to recognize and practise the duty of evangelizing the Gentiles."

"The naming of James and John . . . is still more noteworthy . . . it can hardly be by accident that . . . the names . . . are the names of the three who according to Galatians ii. 9 were the 'pillars' of the primitive Church, and who at the Council of Jerusalem, though at first averse, in the end gave their sanction to the mission to the Gentiles; it can hardly be mere

[1] *Encycl. Bibl.*, 4573–4576, art. "Simon Peter."

accident, *even although there the James intended is no longer the son of Zebedee, but James the Brother of Jesus.*"

But there is even more to come. "Their fellows in the other boat," who in v. 7 are called in to help, are to be distinguished from James and John, who in v. 10 are described as "partners," a different Greek word.[1] "The fellows," writes Dr. Schmiedel, "were called in to help, because Peter and his comrades—in whose number James and John were thus included—are unequal to their task unaided. *This applies to no one but to Paul and those with him.* In actuality he was the originator of the mission to the Gentiles, but we must remember that here the dominating presupposition is that it was by the original apostles that the mission was begun, at the direct command of Jesus, or of God." Finally, it is left doubtful whether the touch in v. 6, that the nets threatened to break (Greek, "were breaking"), is an allusion to the strain of the Judaizing controversy. But, anyhow, it is regarded as certain that the author of the last chapter of S. John interpreted the passage thus, because he remarks (Jn. xxi. 11) that the net in that case remained unbroken, and this "indicates that the unity of the Church had not come to harm."

I have quoted the passage at length, only drawing attention by means of italics to some of the features of what it is perhaps not unfair to describe, in Dr. Schmiedel's own way, as an unconsciously framed self-revelation put forward in the form of a seemingly critical analysis of a document. What are we to say about the view of S. Luke's Gospel which it implies? The criticism is as interesting to read as it must have been to compile. And at least it draws attention to a truth. The fact that a somewhat similar story is related in a quite different context in another Gospel certainly makes it possible to hold either that there was confusion somewhere, or that one of the two Evangelists is allegorizing. But there is very little in the complete phenomena of S. Luke's Gospel to support the hypothesis that, if there was allegorizing, the allegorizer was S. Luke. It is not in accordance with the facts about S. Luke to suggest that the Cornelius narrative of Acts x. is a picturesque, parabolic personification of the general

[1] Dr. Schmiedel appears to miss the point that a cognate word is used in Gal. ii. 9 ("Cephas and James and John . . . gave unto me and Barnabas the right hands of partnership").

experience of the early Church, and then that the narrative of S. Luke v. is due to the idea that it would be a good thing to represent the earlier Peter as having had the same sort of experience.[1]

(1) In the first place, it would not be difficult, as Dr. Salmon long ago pointed out, to shew in this kind of way that many of the universally believed facts of history, including the general supposed course of constitutional history in France for a long period of years, could not possibly have occurred, because they resemble other facts.[2] After all, events which proceed from permanent tendencies in human nature are likely to resemble one another. All revolutions have some common features. And events which flow from the unwearying perseverance of the Creator are likely to have a great similarity. One sunrise is very like another.

(2) In the second place this particular method of treating the Gospels implies that Prof. Schmiedel retains a not inconsiderable measure of the old Tübingen belief that the Gospels are the elaborate productions of highly sophisticated minds, with subtle tendencies, a belief, in fact, that the Evangelists were German professors. It is a theory which will win degrees of acceptance and degrees of repudiation.

The grounds on which I should not hesitate to say that the Synoptic Gospels are on the whole not compositions of this kind, and that Professor Schmiedel has gravely misconceived the character of the Evangelists, appear on many different pages of this book. So far as the actual interpretation of this passage is concerned, the reply to Schmiedel is somewhat as follows. It is

[1] Harnack and Loisy assign a different origin to this section. Harnack supposes that the incident was part of the lost ending of S. Mark, where it stood, quite correctly (cp. the *Gospel of Peter*, and Lk. xxiv. 34) as the *first* appearance of the Risen Lord. It was afterwards desired to suppress this incident or depose it from its premier place. S. John accordingly makes it the third appearance, and S. Luke (or his authority) boldly antedates the whole story. The "depart from me" really refers to Peter's denial, and "fishers of men" is "Feed my sheep." See *Luke the Physician*, App. iv. The last point is not convincing. The two metaphors are not identical: "fishers of men" occurs in Mk. i. 17; and the appearance to Peter is actually mentioned in Lk. xxiv. 34. "Depart from me" is not in Mark, and *may* therefore be a later accretion. But the calling of Peter to discipleship (even if we dismiss the haul of fish as legendary or misplaced) was certainly a great moment in his life. It is not difficult to believe that a man of simple, childlike character had at such a moment a profound sense of unworthiness.

[2] *Introd. to New Testament*, chap. xviii.

true that fishing is easily used as an illustration of gathering disciples. The analogy may therefore have occurred to the Evangelist. But it may also have occurred to their Master. Some of the Twelve were actually fishermen, and it does not seem impossible, or even in the least degree unlikely, that they had on one occasion the experience of success after protracted failure, and that the Lord turned this to account. The relevance of Peter's confession of sinfulness in the presence of the Master Who had just done a thing which seemed to him deeply impressive is, of course, a matter of opinion. The more Christian the critic, the better (as it seems to me) he will be able to comprehend the feelings of Peter in such a case, and the relevance of his alleged conduct. Schmiedel's own admission reveals the precariousness of the significance assigned to the mention of James and John. And as to the supposed allusion to S. Paul, an allusion so subtle that it was not suspected till the nineteenth century is not likely to have been perpetrated by S. Luke.[1]

But (3) Professor Schmiedel's examination of this one passage suggests a larger question. It is really raised by the typical nature of many of S. Luke's characters. How far are the incidents of his Gospel themselves parables?[2] It is often suggested, to

[1] The further question of the Fourth Gospel cannot be dealt with here. I will only say that it seems impossible to deny that there is in it parable recorded as fact. The question is, How much is parable and how much is fact? Miss Evelyn Underhill's *The Mystic Way* contains an ingenious and attractive argument to the effect that much of what looks like fact is really parable; but I am not completely convinced by it.

[2] In Loisy's *Les Évangiles synoptiques* a great many of the incidents are explained as merely symbolic presentations of spiritual lessons, e.g. iv. 16–30, v. 1–11, etc. The Old Testament is regarded as exercising in many cases a determining influence on the form of the narrative. "L'anecdote de Zachée a le même caractère que celle des dix lépreux et de la femme guérie le jour du sabbat: récit symbolique et sans originalité, procédant de la rédaction plus que de la tradition évangélique" (i. 159); of the story of Martha and Mary "il serait impossible de réfuter péremptoirement celui qui y verrait un pur symbole, conçu d'après le tableau des deux sœurs, Israël et Juda, au livre d'Ézéchiel" (ii. 105). The two sisters in this symbolic narrative represent Jewish and Gentile Christianity. So also "le mauvais larron représente le Judäisme incrédule, la foi du bon larron représente la conversion du monde" (ii. 677). It seems certain that S. Luke himself perceived the applicability of many of his incidents to the purposes of Christian preaching, and I have no wish to deny that there are cases in which the form of his narrative was influenced by his own later knowledge. But Loisy's assignment of motive is constantly oversubtle. Thus Jesus is born in a stable because David was a shepherd (i. 349), and the reason why the centurion (Lk. vii. 3) does not come himself to seek Jesus is perhaps because he represents the Gentiles and so must not come into immediate contact with the Saviour (i. 651). On the other hand, the next paragraph (vii. 11–17) is explained as follows: "Comme, dans le récit précédent, l'évangéliste faisait entrevoir le salut des Gentils sous la figure d'une guérison de païen, opérée à distance par Jésus, il oriente maintenant la pensée du lecteur vers

take an instance in which S. Luke is not the defendant, that the withering of the fig-tree is a case where "parable has hardened into miracle," i.e. that the incident of Mk. xi. 12 ff. and Mt. xxi. 18 ff. has really grown out of some such story as that related in Lk. xiii. 6–9. And it may be so. What then of the Lukan characters, the Samaritan leper, the widow of Nain, Zacchæus, the penitent robber, the persons of the Nativity? By what authority does S. Luke introduce them? This question can best be answered, as it was answered once before, by asking another, not unrelated, question. The Gospel of Christ—was it from Heaven or of men? Or, to expand the counter-query, our answer to this question about S. Luke must depend partly on our belief about these three great and fundamental problems:

(*a*) Is there a divine government of the world?

(*b*) Is there a divine guidance of the Christian Church?

(*c*) Which was there first, the fact or the perception of its typical character? How easy or how difficult is it to believe that persons and incidents which are clearly and instructively typical are also historical, that the things which are obviously written for our admonition really happened for our example? What, in fact, is to be our opinion on the relation between art and nature?

This chapter is already long, and it will be convenient to consider these questions in connexion with the crucial case of the Nativity. But meantime it is perhaps not unreasonable to say that a Christian is likely to take a truer and more enlightened view of nature than anybody else.

That there are some cases of theological or ecclesiastical "contamination" it is impossible to deny. S. Luke's Gospel is not so "churchly" as S. Matthew's. S. Luke, for example, has not collected Our Lord's teaching under various heads for convenience of Church instruction. He has not "rabbinized"[1] as

l'œuvre que le Christ a opérée directement, le salut d'Israël, realisé dans la personne du groupe de croyants, qui a constitué le premier noyau du christianisme. La veuve désolée représente la fille de Sion, Jérusalem, menacée de perdre Israël, son fils unique, et le perdant en effet, pour le recouvrer miraculeusement par la puissance de Jésus" (i. 655). For most of these references I am indebted to the review of Loisy in Emmet, *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels.*

[1] The word is Canon Streeter's. Speaking of the difference between principle and law he says: "Law can only be interpreted casuistically, and on their premises the rabbis were right. Our Lord saw this, and therefore avoided giving any definite

S. Matthew occasionally does, the original principles of Jesus into code and exception. But in a few cases his comparatively late date and his second-generation standpoint peep out. He omits a few expressions, "indignantly," "with anger," "being grieved," and so forth, which appear in S. Mark,[1] which were no doubt true, which were perhaps the recollections of the eye-witness Peter. It happens that he omits entirely some of the Markan paragraphs in which the expressions occur, but it may well be that his omissions of those paragraphs is partly due to the fact that they contained things which he did not think quite edifying or worthy.[2] He emphasizes a little the universal character of the Gospel, he emphasizes its asceticism, and its appeal to women, and also its appeal to the outcast and degraded.[3] But it will hardly be denied that these things have a right to be regarded as chapters in the Gospel of Christianity, quite apart from what S. Luke says about them. And in case it is suggested that Christianity owes them to S. Luke, it is a sufficient reply to point out that the Evangelist's own strength clearly lay much more in the direction of sympathetic apprehension than of creation.[4] Finally, he spares the Twelve [5]

precept which His followers might treat as the rabbis did those of Moses. But humanity loves a definite rule, and Peter asks, 'How oft shall my brother offend and I forgive him?' . . . In at least two cases, Matthew, or the tradition behind him, has begun to make such rules. In Mt. xviii. 15–18 he expands Our Lord's general precept on forgiveness in Lk. xvii. 3, which merely intends 'strive hard for reconciliation,' into a piece of ecclesiastical law. Again, in v. 32 and xix. 9 he adds to Our Lord's quite general ideal condemnation of divorce the practical limitation *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας* (*μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*), where both Mark x. 11 and Luke xvi. 18 keep the original unexpanded form" (*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 221).

[1] This can easily be seen by comparing, e.g., Mk. x. 14 with Lk. xviii. 16; Mk. iii. 5 with Lk. vi. 10. See also Lk. iv. 35 (*μηδὲν βλάψαν*; cp. Mk. i. 26), and S. Luke's treatment of Mk. i. 34 (*πολλούς*) and xiv. 33 (*ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι*) in iv. 40 and xxii. 40 f.

[2] This probably applies to Mk. iii. 21, "For they said, he is beside himself," and Mk. vi. 5, "He could there do no mighty work, save that he laid hands on a few sick folk and healed them; and he marvelled at their unbelief"; also to the fourth Word from the Cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"; perhaps also to some of the incidents in what is called S. Luke's "Great Omission." See below, p. 132 f.

[3] Illustrations of this will be found in vii. 37 f., xv., xix. 1–10, xxiii. 43. The general character of the Lukan emphasis is discussed in chaps. viii. and xiii.–xvi.

[4] "The graciousness and universalism of the Gospel are due to Jesus ultimately, not to the apostle" (i.e. S. Paul)—nor, it may be added with confidence, to the Evangelist (Moffatt, *Introd. to Lit. of New Testament*, p. 281).

[5] He omits, for example, the "Get thee behind me, Satan," spoken to Peter; he omits the ambitious request of James and John, and the flight of the Apostles from the Garden (Mk. xiv. 50), and he is careful to record (xxii. 45) that the disciples at Gethsemane were "sleeping for sorrow."

more than S. Mark or S. Matthew, and he spares the Pharisees.[1]

He misses, then, in a few cases, the clear-cut, realistic portrait of S. Mark. He had not seen with his own eyes, as Peter had, the keen edge and quality of Our Lord's human nature, and he could not always quite believe it. But he believed quite as much as was necessary for his salvation, or for ours. It has been suggested that he attributes to Our Lord, if not actually a Docetic impassibility, at least a Stoic imperturbability, but there is quite enough realism in his Gospel to prove that his second-generation standpoint had not blinded him altogether to the actual, natural facts which must accompany an Incarnation.

2. On the other hand, there are some respects in which his status helped him to arrive at the truth. He perceived clearly that Christianity had grown out of Judaism. And until this is perceived, the origins of Christianity can never be understood. It is sometimes asserted that "Christ did not found the Church." The statement is usually made in the interest of shewing either that S. Paul was the real creator of Christianity, or that the mind of Jesus was completely preoccupied with a hurried message of repentance before the imminent end of the world. As such, as either, it is more than dubious, but the statement in itself may be accepted without hesitation *on the ground that the Church was already founded.* There has never been more than one Church of God. In its embryonic stages it was the Jewish Church. When it was fully constituted it was the Christian Church. That is all.

Now, how did S. Luke, the only Gentile among the writers of the New Testament, come to appreciate the early history of the Christian movement with such remarkable exactness? How is it

[1] He omits some of the anti-Pharisaic passages which appear in, e.g., Mt. xxiii. He passes lightly over the cleansing of the Temple (xix. 45 ff.) and he represents Our Lord as being on several occasions (vii. 36, xi. 37, xiv. 1) a guest in a Pharisee's house. The intercourse there held is not always entirely peaceable, and there are severe passages like xi. 39, 40, 52, xiii. 15, xx. 45 ff. to be reckoned with. But if there is foundation for the complaints of Jewish scholars like Mr. Montefiore and Dr. Abrahams that Christian scholars take or have taken until lately an unduly disparaging view of the value of Pharisaism, then S. Luke may have preserved a more accurate picture than S. Matthew. S. John is very definitely hostile to "the Jews," but in that he is quite clearly reflecting the controversy of the Church with Judaism towards the end of the first century as well as, or perhaps even rather than, the actual controversies of Our Lord's own life.

that although it is perfectly clear that he was himself a universalist, yet the background of his Gospel is as Jewish as S. Matthew's, as Jewish as the real background indubitably was. There is an eloquent passage in Dr. Sanday's *Bampton Lectures*, in which, to clear the Evangelists from the charge of anachronism, he first contrasts the condition of affairs before and after the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, and then asks: "Was there ever an easier problem for a critic to decide whether the sayings and doings which lie before him come from the one side of this chasm or the other?" (p. 284).

Dr. Sanday quotes Mt. v. 23, 24, xxiii. 16, 17, viii. 4; Lk. ii. 22, 24, 36–38; Mk. xii. 13, 14; Mt. x. 23—passages "some belonging to the common matter of all three Gospels, some to the double narrative, and some to a portion peculiar to a single Evangelist." We may add some from S. Luke. It is not likely that he knew that a Jewish boy normally became a "Son of the Law" at the age of thirteen, but that in respect of attendance at Feasts at Jerusalem it was customary to anticipate this by one or two years.[1] He would hardly know this; but his narrative (ii. 42) allows for it. At Nazareth (iv. 16 ff.) Our Lord goes "as his custom was"[2] to the Synagogue on the Sabbath day. After healing the leper, He is careful to enjoin him to make the customary offering (v. 14). Compare also the same injunction in the case of the ten lepers in xvii. 14. The action of the Twelve in plucking corn on the Sabbath is justified (vi. 3) by an appeal to the example of David. The testimony borne by the elders to the centurion, "that he loveth our nation and himself hath built our synagogue," appears to be an additional inducement (vii. 5) to Our Lord to heal the benefactor's servant. The Charge to the Seventy (x. 2–16) is thoroughly Jewish in its tone; verse 4, as Edersheim shews (*Life and Times*, i. 643), is like the rabbinic injunctions not to enter the Temple with staff, shoes, or money-girdle—"to avoid even the appearance of being engaged in other business." In x. 26 f. the whole duty of man is expressed in Mosaic terminology, and the expression is ascribed by S. Luke to the lawyer, and in xvi. 29, 31 the ordinary means of grace are

[1] Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. 235.

[2] There is no real necessity to contrast the "custom" of iv. 16 with the going "in he power of the Spirit" of iv. 14.

described as having and hearing "Moses and the prophets." In xiii. 16 the woman with the spirit of infirmity is sympathetically described as a "daughter of Abraham," and where, in xix. 9, the publican is defended, it is said that even he after all is "a son of Abraham." In xx. 37 the immortality of man is asserted, as earlier the seducings of the Tempter had been met, by a simple appeal to the Old Testament, and in the coming Kingdom the disciples are to "sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (xxii. 30).

A transition is indicated by S. Luke in the following passages. In v. 39, after the saying about the new wine and the old bottles, it is recognized that a man cannot be expected at once to desire what is new; "for he saith, The old is good." In iii. 8 it is laid down that it is not enough to claim physical descent from Abraham, but even so the new race which God can raise up even of the stones will still be "children of Abraham." In iii. 17 the coming Saviour will throughly purge His floor, but it is still "His floor." And lastly, the Forerunner is the greatest (vii. 28) of all those hitherto born of women, though the inauguration of the new Kingdom will lift the lowliest to a level unreachable even by him.

The significance of this is admirably put by Dr. Scott Holland:

> How little the eye-witnesses had seen at the time what was going forward! "They understood none of these things; and the thing was hid from them." That was the wonder of it. That was the note that rang through their recollection. Therefore, they delight, now, in going back to the old facts just as they were when they understood none of them. They show Jesus rigidly circumscribed within local, narrow limits, living as a Jew would live, occupied with a Jew's questions, held within Jewish associations and horizons, bounded by a Jew's experience. He talks as Jews talk. He speaks as with the knowledge that any Jew might possess. He refers to diseases in the Jews' manner. He moves within the circle of Jewish hopes and feelings. The whole Gentile outlook is shut off from Him, except it be through some Roman centurion who astonishes Him by his faith, or through some Syro-Phœnician woman who forces her way in upon Him. Now, as they write the record, the Jewish life had passed entirely into the far past; these Jewish questions had ceased to have a meaning, the hidden Gentilism was their very breath and being. Yet Jesus, the Jew, under these Jewish limitations, was, then and there, in the act of winning His authority to be the whole world's Christ. That was what made these old incidents so

vital, so fascinating. Back, therefore, to the facts as facts, the writers turned the believers' eyes.[1]

The significance is immensely increased when we see that S. Luke has not shrunk, Gentile as he was, from depicting the Apocalyptic background of the Lord's life and the Apocalyptic terminology of His speech. We shall see reason later to suppose that he has slightly modified this element, but, even so, it appears on every page.

It was because he was a member of the Church, associating daily with Christians who had actually been Jews, conscious himself of the stem on which he had been grafted, and knowing that Christianity was the perfection of that which had been crude and tentative experiment, that S. Luke could catch and reproduce the tone so perfectly. He knows as well as any one, and much better than most, that there are times when even the Lord's Mother and Brethren "cannot come at him" (viii. 19), and that there is a sense in which His Mother and Brethren are "they who hear the Word of God and do it" (viii. 21). But he does not forget that, as well as Mary, and as well as the mystical Holy Family which consists of the members of Christ's Body, there was a National Mother and that there are still brethren "according to the flesh." Judaism had not been in the least his own personal preparation for Christianity; in fact, there is reason to believe that it was not in all respects very congenial to him. He leaves out, as being comparatively unimportant for his readers and, I think, less interesting to himself, a good deal of what S. Matthew keeps. But he understood it, because it had been the preparation of the community to which he now belonged. That he knew it had been their preparation is clear from the consistent background which he paints into his Gospel and the changing, developing background, the gradually less Jewish and more Hellenic background which he paints into the Acts.

Further, he even indicates that the mind of man had not been able to keep pace with the unfolding purposes of God. He is, indeed, the historian of the first generation of the Catholic Church, and he brings his book of Acts to a deliberate and prepared conclusion with the arrival of the Apostle to the Gentiles, who

[1] Essay in *Jesus or Christ?*, p. 132.

was also the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians, at the centre of the Roman world. But it is well known that the Christology of the earlier chapters of the book is thoroughly primitive.[1] Our Lord is spoken of as "The Servant of God" and the "Holy Servant Jesus," and, in spite of S. Luke's Pentecostal "solution" of the eschatological problem, he preserves, in his record of early Christian thinking, not a few traces of Messianic views and expectations which he himself had either outgrown or never entertained.

The Evangelist knows, then, that the Gospel was born and bred on Jewish soil. From a Jewish seed it had come to be a tree whose leaves were for the healing of the nations, in the branches of which even the Gentiles could find rest. S. Luke's Book of Acts shews that he knew that there had been development, development from a little, sheltered company to a large Hellenic Church with world-relations and, to use a contemporary word, world-politics. But he was not misled by this development. He never denied that it had taken place. The language of his Gospel is consistently primitive. Though he was no doubt accustomed every day to speak of Jesus as the Lord, he does not, except in about a dozen instances, so speak of Him in his Gospel.[2] Whereas the existing fragment of the so-called *Gospel of Peter* uses no other term, and even goes so far as to say that the women came to the sepulchre on the morning of "the Lord's Day," a gross anachronism, S. Luke retains almost throughout the primitive, non-committal name of "Jesus." Like the other Synoptists, he makes Our Lord speak of Himself as the Son of Man, the primitive title, which is actually avoided by the Epistle-writers. He speaks often of the Kingdom, never of the Church. The Twelve he quite properly calls disciples, although in Acts (e.g. vi. 1, 2, 7, ix. 1, 19, 26, etc.) he uses that word of the general body of baptized adherents. It is easy to see from his narrative of the Passion, from the loving care and completeness with which he relates it, how vital he believed it to be. Yet there is no hint in his story of the theology of the Cross. That story at least is free from theological

[1] It is like that of the almost wholly Jewish *Didache*, which comes to us out of some curious un-Hellenized backwater of the early Church.

[2] The majority of these instances occur in paragraphs which are peculiar to S. Luke, e.g. vii. 13, x. 1, xxii. 61.

"contamination." He records the rending of the Temple Veil, but he does not point any moral. There is no hint, in his story of the Wicked Husbandmen, of any Resurrection of the Son Who was sent last. Why not? He believed firmly in the Resurrection. But this was a pre-Resurrection parable. There is little attempt to cover up the limitations and misunderstandings of the Twelve. He does spare them more than S. Matthew, but he is far from concealing their infirmities.[1] Why? Because he knew that before they became the great spiritual leaders whom he himself had met, there had been an earlier disciple stage.

Once more, the parables. It is likely that something of the obvious symbolism of the ring, the shoes, and the robe in his parable of the Prodigal Son, which has figured in so many sermons, had already occurred to him. The Pauline metaphors of the body and of the spiritual armour would furnish a precedent. But it is not allowed to find its way into his narrative. It is unlikely that he failed to see the Jew-and-Gentile reference of many, if not most, of the other parables.[2] In one or two cases he does point the moral. His version of the New Cloth parable (v. 36) makes Our Lord deprecate not merely patching, but the *rending* of a piece from a new garment to patch an old one—a very strongly worded repudiation of the policy of such as would still spoil Christianity for the sake of Judaism. And he alone notes at the Transfiguration (ix. 33) that Peter's unprofitable suggestion of three tabernacles was made just as the representatives of Law and Prophecy *were passing away*. He is aware that there has been development, and in two or three cases he shews that he is aware of it. But in the great majority of cases such commentary as he was disposed to make in his own mind or was in the habit of making in his personal expositions is rigidly excluded from his text.

[1] Two striking Lukan passages of this sort are ix. 45 ("and they were ignorant of this saying, and it was hid from them that they should not perceive it, and they feared to ask him concerning this saying") and xviii. 34 ("and they understood none of these things, and this saying was hid from them, and they knew not the things which were said"). Cp. also, after the Resurrection, xxiv. 11 ("these words seemed to them as idle talk, and they disbelieved the women").

[2] E.g. xi. 24–26 (on which Dr. Plummer says: "The worship of idols had been exorcized, but that demon had returned as the worship of the letter, and with it the demons of covetousness, hypocrisy, spiritual pride, uncharitableness, faithlessness, formalism, and fanaticism," *Commentary*, p. 305), x. 25–37 (The Good Samaritan), xiv. 16–24 (The Great Supper), and xx. 9–18, where note especially the appreciation that follows in v. 19.

CHAPTER VII

THE APOCALYPTIC CHRIST

An earlier chapter of this book contained an attempt to sketch the Apocalyptic background of Our Lord's life and of the Gospels which record it. What was then said may here be summed up in a few sentences.

The main subject of Our Lord's preaching was the Old Testament and later Jewish doctrine, which He in important respects improved and spiritualized, of the Coming Age. This Age or Kingdom is to be brought in by a Messiah, whom He describes, in the Enochian manner, as the Son of Man. By this term He without doubt meant Himself. How far His claim to the title Son of Man can be called actual rather than potential, how far the Kingdom can be described as present, and in what proportion He combined the catastrophic and the evolutionary elements in His teaching, are points on which scholars are not agreed. The extreme school of Schweitzer refer all the allusions to the future. Those who are most willing to take account of all the facts and shirk none of them find, as might be expected, that no one single explanation will meet the case.

It is a commonplace that the predictions in the Gospels of a speedy return in glory were not literally fulfilled. S. Luke, as we have seen, has a partial solution of the problem in his implicit doctrine that Christ had returned at Pentecost and was, by His Spirit, immanent in the Church.[1] This was considered at an earlier stage of this book, when we were concerned with the general relations between the period covered by the Gospels and the life of the Church. S. Luke has another solution in his doctrine, to which we shall come in a moment, of "Transmuted Eschatology." Meantime it is essential to assure ourselves once

[1] See above, p. 55 f.

more that whatever be the date and manner of the fulfilment which Our Lord expected of His words, His message was definitely supernatural: He claimed already, and intended at His return to claim still more compellingly, a supernatural position; His Kingdom was to be unworldly and other-worldly, and He desired an unworldly, other-worldly character in its members. How far His actual teaching was meant to be provisional, how far it may truly be characterized as *Interimsethik*, valid only until the cosmic revolution should bring in the new kingdom and the new life, is, as I say, disputed, and S. Luke is a guide who may be followed.

As far as S. Luke's Gospel is concerned there seems to be no doubt that his picture is of an Apocalyptic Figure. I quote a startling but instructive passage from an author whose opinion is particularly valuable because he perhaps has never heard of Schweitzer and has not a very profound acquaintance with the writings of Professor Burkitt. Mr. G. K. Chesterton says: "Instead of looking at books and pictures about the New Testament, I looked at the New Testament. There I found an account, not in the least of a person with his hair parted in the middle or his hands clasped in appeal, but of an extraordinary being with lips of thunder and acts of lurid decision, flinging down tables, casting out devils, passing with the wild secrecy of the wind from mountain isolation to a sort of dreadful demagogy; a being who often acted like an angry god—and always like a god" (*Orthodoxy*, p. 269). No doubt this summary description is drawn rather from the Markan than from the Lukan story. But S. Luke also has his contribution.

That S. Luke in general gives us the picture of a Jewish Christ was shewn in the last chapter. In this place we are concerned with the more specifically Apocalyptic element of the contemporary Judaism. How does he deal with that?

To begin with, he certainly accepts in outline the Old Testament expectation. An interesting example of the discriminating way in which he deals with it is found in xiii. 29. S. Matthew, in the parallel passage (viii. 11), says: "Many shall come from the east and the west and shall sit down *with Abraham and Isaac* in the kingdom of heaven." Notice exactly what is involved in the Matthæan version. The kingdom is universal, but it is neverthe-

less defined in terms of actual Judaism.[1] It consists in the society of the patriarchs. Now turn to the version of S. Luke. Whereas the context in S. Matthew was the healing of the Centurion's servant—an incident which S. Luke (vii. 9) is content to close with "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel"—in this passage (xiii. 27) he records the saying about the patriarchs, but gives it a different turn: "Depart from me, ye workers of iniquity. There shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth, when *ye shall see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God*,[2] and yourselves cast forth without. (29) And they shall come from the east and west, and from the north and south, and *shall sit down in the kingdom of God*." S. Luke, in fact, has dealt with the Old Testament and its heroes in a discriminating way. For him the genesis of the kingdom is still Israel, but the wine has burst the bottles, and the old definition, *as a definition, can no longer be applied.*

Another example of his discrimination is his narrative of the road to Emmaus. The difficulty of the two disciples is overwhelmingly and overflowingly answered by the event. S. Luke has not the least doubt that the Jewish expectation is fulfilled, and more than fulfilled, in Christ. But it was a Jewish expectation. "We thought it had been he which should have redeemed Israel." The Risen Saviour "made as though he would have gone further." He was prepared, if they had been able to follow, to lead them far beyond their expectation. But He begins to do so by expounding to them Moses and the prophets.

It is difficult not to believe that S. Luke has here caught something very like the real mind of Jesus. Our Lord was Himself what may be called a discriminating patriot, and the Gentile yet philo-Judaic Evangelist seems to have reproduced with wonderful success the sure and balanced judgment of Him Who was "the pillar of a people's hope" and also "the centre of a world's desire."

[1] It is as when those Churchmen who, without undervaluing churchmanship, are nevertheless disposed to take liberal views, allow that members of the Society of Friends may have a Baptism, or a Confirmation, "of Desire." If I remember rightly, Andrew Lang said in an obituary notice of a distinguished agnostic that he was "a sad, good Christian after all."

[2] It is worth noting that Marcion in his adaptation of S. Luke substituted for "Abraham . . . the prophets" the non-committal words "all the righteous."

Even the peaceful chapters in which S. Luke tells the story of the Nativity bring out the expectant side of contemporary Judaism. The child forerunner is to be an Elias, the Magnificat is a song of revolution; the visiting and redeeming of God's people, which is betokened by the birth of John, is "a horn of salvation raised up in the house of David." Simeon and Anna and those to whom they speak are "looking for the redemption of Israel." The Child is "set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel, and for a sign which shall be spoken against." A sword shall go through the mother's heart, which shall rend her affections and shall sunder and reveal the thoughts of many.

A *locus classicus* is, of course, the Temptation, that mysterious passage which indicates that Our Lord, after the exhilaration of His Baptism, passed through an experience comparable to that which mystics call "the dark night of the soul." [1] It is well known that the order of the three temptations differs in S. Matthew and S. Luke. In S. Matthew the final, culminating temptation is "Fall down and worship me." In S. Luke it is "Cast thyself down." It was formerly said (e.g. by Dr. Westcott) that inasmuch as the Kingdom was a dominant thought in the first Gospel, the crowning temptation there was naturally that in which the Messiah is pressed to use the illegitimate means of political or military force for the establishing of His kingdom. But now it is suggested, e.g. by Canon Streeter in *Foundations*, p. 101, that "Cast thyself down" means "Make the traditional appearance as the Son of Man, riding on the clouds of heaven." If so, it is, if possible, more Messianic and Apocalyptic than the other. The old distinction therefore does not hold. But the point is, that the whole Temptation is to be explained as the self-communing of One Who either newly realizes Himself to be Messiah, or at least realizes that He must now begin His work. How is He to adopt and fulfil, and yet purge and spiritualize, the old concep-

[1] It is not necessary to suppose that the Tempter appeared to Our Lord in visible form, any more than it is to suppose that the "I beheld Satan" of x. 18 or the temptations implied in iv. 13 ("the devil departed from him for a season") and xxii. 28 ("ye are they that have continued with me in my temptations") involve visible appearances. The striking picture (by W. Dyce, R.A.) prefixed to Sanday's *The Life of Christ in Recent Research* presents a conception of the Temptation which it is difficult to dismiss. On the other hand, visualization in such a case does not seem to be psychologically impossible.

tions ? He will not use His power to satisfy His personal needs, He will not commit the error of supposing that a spiritual kingdom can be established by material means, He will not be the conventional *deus ex caelo*. But, nevertheless, He will be the Messiah, about Whose person all these traditions have grown up. He is not come to destroy, but to fulfil. "I that speak unto thee am He." He transcends the old categories, bursts the old limitations, rejects many of the old associations, but He is Messiah.

S. Luke's parables—far more of them than is commonly supposed, and yet not so many in S. Luke as in S. Matthew—are capable of bearing a forward, that is, an eschatological meaning. The thoroughgoing eschatologists refer everything to the future, which is an error. But short of this mechanical interpretation of the whole message of Jesus as a sort of post-dated cheque, the reference is often to the future. The Lord's Prayer, especially in the Lukan version (xi. 2) is an example. With the Matthæan version it might be contended that "Thy Kingdom come" is to be interpreted in terms of "Thy will be done," and that the interest of the prayer is dominantly ethical. But S. Luke omits the clause "Thy will be done," [1] and the interest of his version of the prayer is largely eschatological. Of the actual parables, the Rich Fool (xii. 16), the parables about the duty of watching in xii. 35–48, the Pounds (xix. 11) [2] and the Wicked Husbandmen (xx. 9), and of course the definitely eschatological matter of chapter xxi., look forward to events that have not yet occurred. On the whole the eschatological element and eschatological interest in S. Luke's Gospel is slightly smaller than in the other strands of the Synoptic record. Canon Streeter, who finds in this connexion in the Gospels an increasing series, Q—Mark—Matthew, that is to say, that S. Mark is more eschatological than Q, and S. Matthew than S. Mark, adds that this does not apply to S. Luke, "in whom a slight, but only very slight, tendency to tone down eschatological language can be detected, doubtless the result of

[1] There is a curious alternative to the Lukan text, found in Marcion and one or two other very early witnesses : "Thy holy spirit come upon us and sanctify us."

[2] It is to be noticed, however, that the introduction to the parable of the Pounds is highly significant : "He added and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and *because they supposed that the kingdom of God should immediately appear.*" Cp. xvii. 22, xxi. 9, 12—cases in which S. Luke hints at a postponement.

Pauline influence." [1] Thus Lk. vi. 46 (" Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say ") is less eschatological than Mt. vii. 21 (" Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven "). The Parable of the Pounds ends (Lk. xix. 27) without the conventional formula of Mt. xxv. 30 (" there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth "). The prediction in Lk. xiii. 35 (" ye shall not see me till ye say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord ") is intended by S. Luke to refer to the Palm Sunday Entry (xix. 38), though S. Matthew, who probably dates the whole section more correctly (xxi. 1 f.), gives it an eschatological meaning. It seems likely enough that in some of these cases (e.g. Lk. vi. 46 = Mt. vii. 21) the first Evangelist has " eschatologized " an originally non-eschatological saying. To do so is one of his tendencies, e.g. it is quite possible that the detailed eschatology of the explanation of the Parable of the Tares (Mt. xiii. 37–43) is due to him, and not to Our Lord. The decision in any given case depends on the amount of eschatology which must be believed to have been contained in the original source, a subject on which there is considerable difference of expert opinion.

The general solution of the " eschatological difficulty " is, as we have seen, the solution which was adopted, although with varying emphasis and consistency, by the Evangelists, and has been adopted, on the whole, by Christendom. The " Coming " was, for the time being, realized when the Church was born. In particular S. Luke is associated with the belief that the dispensation of the Spirit in the Church is a real continuation of the Life of Jesus. But he is also concerned to shew that the Life of Jesus was the necessary exordium to the dispensation of the Spirit. Where the King is, there is the Kingdom. This is what has been described as Transmuted Eschatology. It is not found only in S. Luke, but it is a feature of his Gospel. It means that events which have hitherto been supposed to be connected with the future advent of Messiah are actually occurring now.[2]

[1] *Oxford Studies*, p. 426 n. (but see subsequent qualifications in *Foundations*, p. 112 n.). For Q see below, p. 136 f. It means at least the non-Markan matter which is common to S. Matthew and S. Luke, with perhaps a good deal more.

[2] The term is due to Prof. von Dobschütz, whose *Eschatology of the Gospels* is a valuable corrective to the extreme view of Schweitzer. He points out (p. 150) that there is a double transmutation " in the sense that what was spoken of in the Jewish

There is a familiar parallel. English Churchmen will readily recall the phrase of the Catechism, "I was made . . . an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." Is the kingdom there present or future? Does inheritor mean one who has already inherited or one who will inherit in the future? Plainly, it means both. The Church of the baptized is a real home of grace, and its members have a real communion with the heavenly world. But they are not yet perfected.[1]

So in the Gospel. Our Lord knew that His own mission, vital as it was, was nevertheless of a preliminary character. "Greater things than these shall ye do." He taught the disciples to anticipate the time when He should belong, not only to the little group of persons who happened to be in earth at that time and in that place, but to all persons in all places and at all times; He taught them to lift up their heads and look forward to the coming dispensation, when, after the universalizing which is pictured for us by the Ascension, He should be poised, as it were, above all human history, and there should be no distinction between Jew and Gentile, ancient and modern, contemporary witness or mystical believer. The kingdom was not yet, because the Spirit was not yet come, and the community was not yet spiritual. But where Jesus is, the kingdom is not altogether absent. The eschatological conceptions are transmuted into terms of what is already before the eyes of men.

Here are some of the signs of the transmutation. It may be that Peter's confession, whatever the actual intention of the

eschatology as to come in the last days is taken here as already at hand in the lifetime of Jesus; transmuted at the same time in the other sense that what was expected as an external change is taken inwardly." But he seems content to place the eschatological and non-eschatological parts of Our Lord's teaching side by side, without relating them to one another. Thus, his explanation (p. 7) of the famous verse Mt. x. 23 seems rather cursory. It is, no doubt, because he overestimates the significance of his true remark (p. 3) that whereas "eschatology was not so long ago the last chapter of dogmatics . . . time went on, and New Testament exegesis became historical instead of dogmatic."

[1] Thus the Church doctrine of the Eucharist looks backward ("Who in the same night in which He was betrayed. . . . This is My Body which is given for you") and forward ("until His coming again"). The latter thought is the more Jewish part; the former, the element which has appealed more to Gentile believers. The Eucharistic doctrine of the Jewish *Didache* is eschatological, the doctrine of Justin is sacrificial. Schweitzer, as might be expected, lays the whole stress on eschatology. The Sacraments have the effect of "sealing" (cp. Ezek. ix. 4) the disciples in preparation for the coming Day. See *Paul and his Interpreters*, Eng. tr., p. 243; *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 375 f.

speaker, was accepted by Our Lord as pointing to the future. But the famous, "I beheld Satan fallen from heaven" (x. 18) seems to be an accomplished fact. And in the succeeding verses, while the fact of the disciples' names being written in heaven perhaps points forward,[1] it is undoubtedly assumed that in the case of the subject spirits the powers of the kingdom are already in operation.

More certain are the following. At the first sermon in Nazareth (iv. 21), "to-day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." The Sons of the bridechamber are not to fast while the bridegroom is with them (v. 34). "Blessed are the eyes which see the things which ye see" (x. 23). "If I with the finger of God cast out demons, no doubt the kingdom of God *is come upon you*" (xi. 20). Whatever be the meaning of the famous phrase, "The kingdom of God is within you" (xvii. 21),[2] at least the time referred to is the present. The kingdom has to some extent arrived already.[3]

Above all, there is the reply sent back to S. John Baptist when he asked, "Art thou he that should come or look we for another?" The reply is a frank appeal to the signs of the kingdom which are before the eyes of the messengers. "Go, and tell John what things ye have heard and seen: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear: the dead are raised up and the poor have the Gospel preached unto them" (vii. 22).

[1] The idea of "names written in the book of life" (Phil. iv. 3; Rev. iii. 5, xx. 15, xxi. 27, etc.) is a favourite Apocalyptic idea.

[2] The actual meaning of the words is almost certainly "within you," not "among you." For "among" S. Luke would have said ἐν μέσῳ, which occurs seven times in his Gospel (see especially xxii. 27) and four times in Acts. (One of the *New Sayings of Jesus* (Grenfell and Hunt, 1904), which may conceivably be genuine, though it includes a Greek proverb, is "the Kingdom of Heaven is within you, and whosoever shall know himself shall find it.") The difficulty is that the words are addressed to the Pharisees. For the present purpose the difference of meaning is not material. It is to be noted that the passage is the great stronghold of those "Liberal" theologians who minimize the eschatological elements of the original Gospel. See p. 50, n. 1.

[3] My friend and former pupil, Mr. Philip Carrington, points out to me that when Dr. Winstanley (*Jesus and the Future*, pp. 61–72) maintains that there is in the earliest reports of Our Lord's utterances no clear reference to a present Kingdom, but nevertheless admits that it is "potentially present" and "an earnest of its power is recognized in the acts of Jesus," that this, though "barely visible and meagre," is yet a "commencement," and that "loyal adherents" "see the tokens of the Messianic age already about them," he is giving to the word "future" an unusually enlarged sense. A Kingdom of which the results are already in operation is a Kingdom that has begun to arrive. So Mr. Montefiore remarks on Lk. xvi. 16, "Here the Kingdom is not merely future. In one sense men can and do enter it already" (*Synoptic Gospels*, ii. p. 999).

Once more, the Lukan transmuted eschatology is summed up in one phrase of the story of Zacchæus (xix. 1–10), "This day is salvation come to this house." The extravagances of thorough-going eschatology can be met by the statement, which in itself is likely to be generally accepted, that this saying might have been assigned, with equal verisimilitude, to almost any of the incidents related in the Gospel. If we had found it in connexion with any of the persons whom Jesus ever met, we should hardly have questioned its appropriateness.

Finally, xxii. 69 ("From now the Son of Man shall be seated at the right hand of the power of God"), reveals that even if the time of glory be in the future, it is a future strictly continuous with the present time.

In general, the Gospel ethics, both in the Evangel as a whole and in S. Luke in particular, are largely independent of eschatology. "When we recall the prevailing tone of ethical teaching, and still more the habitual attitude of the Teacher to the world in which He found himself, it is difficult to see in it a predominating quality of indifference to the world's affairs, or a complete preoccupation with a supernatural catastrophe. On the contrary, the ethics of Jesus exhibit on the whole a kind of sanity, universality, and applicability which are independent of abnormal circumstances and free from emotional strain. There is nothing apocalyptic in the parable of the Good Samaritan, or in the appropriation by Jesus of the two great commandments, or in the prayer for to-day's bread and the forgiveness of trespasses, or in the praise of peace-making or of purity of heart. Yet in these, and not in the mysterious prophecies of an approaching desolation, the conscience of the world has found its Counsellor and Guide." [1]

After all, we know that Our Lord was actually reproached because He lived too much in the world, because He came eating

[1] Prof. F. G. Peabody, quoted in Emmet, *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels*, p. 62. Compare the fact pointed out by von Dobschütz (*The Eschatology of the Gospels*, p. 153 f.) that passages related by S. Mark and Q and thus proved to have been popular and widely known, are mainly non-eschatological. Thus he notes that of the thirty passages of this kind quoted in Burkitt's *Gospel History* (p. 147 f.) only seven can be called eschatological. The rest "contain non-eschatological matter of a moral character." And yet the Gospel ethics are never mere ethics. "It is idle to pretend that His influence has been purely ethical. He has satisfied, not only the moral, but the mystical needs of millions for centuries, and His moral influence has been largely dependent on His mystical influence" (Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, p. 102).

and drinking, and was the friend of publicans and sinners. His commands are given absolutely. His teaching, for example, about marriage goes back to the beginning—*ab initio autem non fuit sic* —and, as far as we can see, looks forward to an end of which the near imminence is not even hinted in this context. Part of S. Paul's teaching on the subject (1 Cor. vii. 26, 29) is really *Interimsethik*, but Our Lord's teaching is not. So, too, the commands to love your enemies, to forgive, to be pitiful and patient, to be like Mary rather than like Martha, not to live in the clouds,[1] but to love God and serve man—all these are absolute and timeless. They have actually been attempted, and found to be a true way of life, by persons for whom any expectation of a coming cosmic crisis is at most an occasional side-thought. "We are struck at once by the fact that the shortness of the time is, in fact, never emphasized in the Sermon on the Mount, or in many other parts of Christ's ethical teaching. He does not say 'Give away your coat, for there will never be another winter,' or 'Do not trouble about the needs of the body since the time is quickly coming when they will all be superseded.' On the contrary, it is 'Realize the true values of the earthly and the spiritual in all conditions of life, and trust your Heavenly Father.' And so we find, in fact, all through Christ's teaching that where the eschatological motive, with its stress on the shortness of the time, is prominent, the contents of the teaching are commonplace ('repent'), and in no way affected by this idea. On the other hand, where the contents of this teaching might be regarded as determined by the eschatological outlook, the eschatological motive is conspicuously absent." [2]

S. Luke, then, knows how to rescue the Apocalyptic element from its association only with the end of all things, and also to shew that it is part of the complete and permanent Gospel. Can

[1] μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε, Lk. xii. 29. Cf. Ps. cxxxi. (cxxx.) 1.

[2] C. W. Emmet in *The Faith and the War*, p. 200. See also the same writer's paper, "Is the Teaching of Jesus an *Interimsethik*?" read at Leiden Congress for the History of Religions, and printed in the *Expositor*, Nov. 1912, p. 423 f. Mr. Montefiore concludes his *Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels* with the words: "He was not always the prophet of doom and repentance: he was also the *Seel-sorger*; the saver of souls, the shepherd. . . . He does not merely predict that, in the future, in the Kingdom which is to come, men will know God truly; he seeks by his own care and influence and love, by his example and teaching, to make them know God truly now. He seeks to save and to redeem" (ii. 1098).

he do this with the more violent, catastrophic element in the Apocalyptic? It is commonly asserted that he is not quite equal to dealing with what may be called the extreme left wing of the traditional material. Canon Streeter's verdict was referred to just now, and it may be allowed that in this as in some other respects S. Luke's is the mildest of the three Gospels. Its author is, as Dante said, the *scriba mansuetudinis Christi*. It is also the most Hellenic. Thus in xxi. 28 he concludes a highly eschatological passage[1] with the comparatively quiet ending, "When these things begin to come to pass, look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh." Elsewhere he to a certain extent "rationalizes" the predictions. In xxii. 69 he at least connects the coming glory with the present by adding "from now," and in the same passage he omits "and coming on the clouds of heaven," which is found in both Mk. and Mt. In xxi. 20 he substitutes for the mysterious phrase of Daniel the much more intelligible gloss, "Jerusalem compassed by armies." There is, in fact, little doubt that he would regard the destruction of Jerusalem as *a* "Coming" of the Lord.

But there is an impressive group of passages in the Gospel which shew that the Evangelist does not refuse to handle the more violent element in the material that came before him.

One of the most striking features in the character of the Apocalyptic Christ, as depicted by S. Luke, is His attitude of being constrained and borne along by an absorbing—even violent—sense of mission. It is in this direction that Eschatology has done so much to vindicate Christianity as a real religion. One of the conclusions of the eschatologists in which there is surely a great deal of truth is that Our Lord solemnly and deliberately approached His death, believing that it would release forces which were required for the establishment of His kingdom. S. Matthew[2] and S. Luke would agree that it was His Death and Resurrection which burst the bounds of merely Jewish nationality. And S. Luke is, of course, particularly associated with the position

[1] Although Dr. Abbott speaks of "the comparatively cheerful discourse on the Coming" of Lk. as contrasted with Mt. (*Encycl. Bibl.*, ii. 1792).

[2] "Universalism" only appears in S. Matthew's Gospel in the last chapter, after the Resurrection. There is no earlier parallel to xxviii. 19, "Go ye and make disciples of all the nations." Cp. Lk. xxiv. 47–49.

that His Ascension and Return at Pentecost completed the process of universalization, and made Him available for the needs of all lands and all times. But within Our Lord's earthly lifetime there is evidence from S. Luke's Gospel that He anticipated something of the kind.

It is seen most clearly in the long section ix. 51–xviii. 14, the contents of which are largely peculiar to S. Luke. It is the story of the final journey to Jerusalem. It begins with the striking passage, "And it came to pass, when the days were being accomplished that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem" (ix. 51). There is a new sternness in the paragraphs which immediately follow. The ignorant Samaritans are not punished for their ignorance. But three postulants (57–62) are warned of hardships and deprivations that now begin to be involved in following. It may be noted that the third member of the group appears only in S. Luke. In xii. 49–51, a passage of which two-thirds is Lukan only, Our Lord says, "I came to cast fire upon the earth, and what will I" (that is, probably, "what should I then have left to work for") "if it is already kindled?[1] But I have a Baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened [or 'constrained'] till it be accomplished?" i.e. "When death shall have baptized Me into a freer, less straitened life, then I can truly and perfectly inaugurate the kingdom." In xiii. 32, another "Lukan only" passage, Our Lord says, "Go, and say to that fox [Herod Antipas], Behold, I cast out demons and perform cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected. Howbeit, I must go on my way to-day and to-morrow, and the day following; for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem." In xvi. 16 we have a reference, apparently in praise, to the temper required in those who would lay violent hold of what God gives—"the law and the prophets were until John; from that time the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it."[2] The

[1] It seems just possible that this is an allusion to the fierce suggestion of James and John that they should call down fire from heaven on the inhospitable Samaritan village (ix. 54). A variation of this saying is quoted by Origen (*Hom. in Jerem.* iii, p. 778), apparently from some Apocryphal Gospel, "He that is near me is near the fire; he who is far from me is far from the kingdom."

[2] This passage, or rather the parallel passage in S. Matthew—"from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and violent men

Palm Sunday Entry, and the weeping over the city, which immediately follows (xix. 41), are the actions of One Who knows what is before Him. The eagerness of the prelude to the Supper, "with desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer" (xxii. 15), and the solemnity of the words spoken in the Garden, "this is your hour and the power of darkness" (xxii. 53), are two more elements in the tragic picture. And the whole bearing of Our Lord throughout the Lukan account of the Passion is that of One Who moves serenely, deliberately, sadly, freely along a predetermined road.[1] S. Luke's own reconciliation of the freedom and the fixity of the final issue is found in Acts ii. 23: "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and *by wicked hands* have crucified and slain."

Thus the Lukan solution is of two kinds. The religion of Jesus was capable of being carried over into the quiet, regular processes of a Church, and the Church itself was only an extension of the Incarnate Life of Jesus. Jesus of Nazareth, Who required faith in those around Him, Who demanded from them an intense activity of co-operating prayer, was well assured that, though God His Father would shortly make Him Lord and Christ, yet His Lordship and His Christhood would not become perfectly effective till all Israel should be saved and the fulness of the Gentiles should come in. His own appointed triumph and the coming of the kingdom with power and great glory lay on the other side of death. But that death would be for the ransom of many. The spiritual children of His Body were already come almost to the birth. But without the Cross He would not have

take it by force"—which is generally considered the more authentic version, is connected by Dr. E. F. Scott with Our Lord's constant teaching, as recorded especially by S. Luke, about the value of insistent prayer (*The Kingdom and the Messiah*, p. 142). It is as if He had been asked, "What hinders the coming of the kingdom?" and His answer was, "It depends on you. If you can storm the courts of heaven with your prayers, and lay yourselves down, as living stones, to build up the highway on which it may arrive, then it will be soon." See also Dr. Scott's admirable exegesis (*op. cit.* p. 228 f.) of Lk. xii. 49–51.

[1] See also xviii. 31, xxii. 22, 37, xxiv. 25–27, 44–47. Compare (at an earlier period) iv. 1, 14. The note of freedom will be observed if we compare any of these passages with Ezek. iii. 14. A desire to assimilate our Lord's experience to another passage of Ezekiel (viii. 3) led in *The Gospel according to the Hebrews* to the following: "Just now my mother the Holy Spirit took me by one of my hairs, and bore me away to the great mountain Thabor." A similar incident is related in *Bel and the Dragon*, 36. Cp. also Ezek. xi. 1, 24, xxxvii. 1, xliii. 5.

strength to bring them forth. Only that Baptism of blood would summon into being the sons and daughters that God would give Him. His pangs would be their life. And the new life to which He himself should come through death would then be their life for ever. Parent and children, Saviour and saved, Christ and His Church, for ever.

So Jesus of Nazareth must have His followers, and Christ must have His Church.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SON OF MAN AMONG THE SONS OF MEN

THE Gospel, which is so full of mystery and Apocalyptic, draws also a homely picture of the friend of sinners.

It may seem, perhaps, after what has been said about the Enochian associations of the title "Son of Man," [1] that the heading of this chapter is not really legitimate. But even if it be true that "Son of Man" in Our Lord's life is always Apocalyptic,[2] yet it was even in that connexion joined by Him to the idea of suffering. Further, it was of all possible Messianic titles the most broadly human. It was inclusive as far as the Jewish nation was concerned. It summed up the twofold expectation of the Messianic kingdom and its representative head. And it was also inclusive in a larger sense. It was much less purely national than the Hebrew title of Messiah. It prepared the way, as S. Luke undoubtedly perceives, for the Christian doctrine of Christ and the Church which was presently to emerge.

If, on the other hand, it could be supposed, with Dr. Abbott,[3] that the title is (*a*) not Messianic at all, and (*b*) adopted from Canonical rather than Deutero-canonical sources, and that its reference is to Gen. i. 26 ("man, in our image"), to Ezekiel, where it is used for the prophet himself, and to Dan. vii. 13, where it means "Man" who is to have dominion over "Beast," its use in connexion with "the sons of men" would need no defence.

Anyhow, the purpose of this chapter is only to indicate some ways in which S. Luke draws attention to the sheer humanity of Jesus, both in Himself and as the central figure of the groups by which He was surrounded.

[1] See p. 38 f.

[2] "His use of it as a title of *office* was always proleptic . . . but it always included, when applied to Himself, a reference to His present human life" (McNeile, *S. Matthew*, p. xxv.).

[3] *The Message of the Son of Man.*

(i) The Son of Man is represented as living the ordinary life. In fact, the common portrait in most people's minds is drawn largely from S. Luke. His is the domestic Gospel. It is he who shews Our Lord a guest in the house of His friends. His Jesus is familiar with the life of the poor man, with the patching by which he lengthens the life of his cheap clothes, with the awkward situation created by the unexpected arrival of a stranger late at night, with the homely nuisance (perhaps the serious embarrassment) of a shilling that has somehow rolled into a corner of the kitchen. His Jesus knows the facts of country life, the ways of fish and seeds and flowers, the price of sparrows, the signs of to-morrow's weather. He knows, as any countryman will know, that a man must water his beasts or deal with a sudden accident on the farm if it be half a dozen Sabbaths. He is in the midst of His people as One that serveth. Unlike the ascetic John, He comes "eating and drinking," He feeds the bodies of His friends with bread, the poor man's food, and He will leave the same elemental means of living on the everlasting Table of His spiritual hospitality. He preaches about figs and brambles and children and beggars and fathers and sons from the pulpit of a hill-side or a fishing-boat, in common dress and workaday employ. Two paragraphs of Dr. T. R. Glover will express my meaning much better than I could myself. "It was Mary, we may believe, who put the leaven in three measures of meal . . . and Jesus sat by the fire and watched it. In after years the sight came back to Him. He remembered the big basin, the heaving, panting mass in it, the bubbles struggling out, swelling and breaking, and the level rising and falling. It came to Him as a picture of the Kingdom of Heaven at work in the individual man and in the community." And again: "They saw Him in every sort of situation, at every sort of disadvantage, and they came to know Him, they would have said, through and through—though afterwards they might not have been so sure. They talked with Him, one supposes, about every conceivable topic in which men could be interested, Herods and Roman Governors, zealot tales told by Simon, custom-house memories of Levi, fisher-talk of Peter and James and John, neighbour-talk of houses and men and their sons—even gossip of Galilean tragedies

in Jerusalem and accidents of falling towers. What failed to interest Him ? " [1]

It is worth noting that nearly all the material for this impression is taken from S. Luke.

A large proportion of Our Lord's teaching, as recorded in this Gospel, arises out of casual questions or incidents of everyday life. Examples are xi. 45, xiii. 1, xiii. 31, xviii. 18, xx. 2, xxi. 5, xxii. 24. The Parables, in many cases, have a similar origin. The Two Debtors is the result of neglectful discourtesy and an unspoken thought of Simon the Pharisee (vii. 36–50). The Good Samaritan is an attempt to pierce the self-complacency of a lawyer (x. 29). The Rich Fool is Our Lord's comment on a family quarrel (xii. 13), the Great Supper on a piece of idle sentiment (xiv. 15). The three " Lost " Parables of the fifteenth chapter are the answer to a reproach. The Lukan Parables are not formal expositions of the nature of the Kingdom, they are appeals *ad hominem*. And they are drawn for the most part, not from the processes of nature, but from the facts of human life and character.[2]

Our Lord in His Ministry had very little privacy, except what He made for Himself from time to time. Too poor to buy seclusion, too greatly beloved to be left to it for long, too human, it would seem, to desire it overmuch, He lived, from the day of His unscreened Nativity to the day of His public and notorious Crucifixion, the crowded, gossip-ridden and unleisured life which in this world is the invariable lot of all but a few favoured persons.

(ii) The Suffering Servant.

It has generally been held that the mysterious group of the four living creatures in the first chapter of Ezekiel's prophecy is

[1] *The Meaning and Purpose of a Christian Society*, pp. 18, 47. Cp. *The Jesus of History*, by the same author, pp. 27–28, 81. Mr. Glover has brought out with vivid accuracy the fact that the experience on which Our Lord drew on His teaching was largely the experience of His own home life. " Are we to think that all the tenderness of Jesus came to Him by a miracle when He was thirty years of age ? Must we not think it was all growing up in that house and in that shop ? Or did He never tell a story—He who tells them so charmingly—till He wanted parables ? " (p. 30). Again, on vii. 32 : " How strange, and how delightful, that the great Gospel, full of God's word for mankind, should have a little corner in it for such reminiscences of children's games ! " (p. 36).

[2] Dr. Stanton points out that in the one exception to this generalization—the Barren Fig-Tree—" the conversation of the proprietor and the gardener forms a large and significant part of the parable " (*Gospels*, etc., ii, p. 231).

capable of being treated as symbolic of the four Evangelists. The exact meaning of the symbolism is "variously explained by different writers from Irenæus (III. ii. 8) downwards. But all agree in assigning the Ox or Calf to S. Luke." [1] The ox is the sacrificial animal, and S. Luke's is a Gospel of sacrifice. I leave on one side the question of atoning, priestly sacrifice which, except for occasional symbol and suggestion, S. Luke excludes from his own range,[2] and speak only of its tale of suffering. From the outset the Saviour is rejected and despised. And this is natural. "Thus is it written, that the Christ should suffer." Given the conditions of human life, given the fact of sin, the necessary lot of Love Incarnate is service and sacrifice. And so he is born in a stable, because the house of public entertainment is occupied by more important persons. As an infant, it is said of Him that He is for a sign that shall be spoken against. As a boy, He is misunderstood by Joseph and His Mother. He is compelled by His knowledge of the history of the chosen people and by the facts of His own life to pronounce His benediction upon the poor, the hungry, the weeping, the hated, and the persecuted. The momentary tumult of acclaim which greets His philanthropic ministries is unintelligent, and distracts Him from His real work. The confession (ix. 20) of the one eager soul who penetrates a little way below the surface is followed immediately by the prediction of the Passion, "The Son of Man must suffer many things." [3] The Cross is a necessary part, not merely of the burden, but of the equipment of His followers. To play the miser with one's life is false economy, but sacrifice is salvation. The

[1] Plummer, *S. Luke*, p. xxii. The writer known as Ps.-Athanasius appears to be an exception.

[2] But it is never very far away. It is not without purpose that the scene of the first two chapters is in and around the Temple, and also that, in Westcott's words, "the last view which St. Luke gives of the office of the risen Saviour corresponds with the earlier traits in which he shews His relation to mankind. . . . He is the High Priest in whose name repentance and remission of sins is to be proclaimed to all nations —the Mediator who sends forth to men the promise of the Father" (*Introd. to Study of Gospels*, pp. 339–340).

[3] On this passage Schmiedel undiscerningly remarks: "Least of all is it credible that Jesus should have put forth such a prediction directly after Peter's Confession. This confession must have been one of the supreme moments in the joyous consciousness of Jesus—the discovery that he was finding recognition as the Messiah and was winning His battle. Suffering and death are the very opposite of all that is looked for in the Jewish Messiah, and of what Jesus at that moment could have looked forward to for himself" (*Encycl. Bibl.*, ii, 1887).

quality and survival-value of a soul is to be gauged by the freedom with which it is content to spend itself (ix. 23, 24).

In the same chapter Moses and Elijah are seen attendant upon the Transfigured Christ. But the subject of their speech with Him is the Death which He is shortly to accomplish in Jerusalem. And the scene of exaltation is followed by a reminder of human suffering, the pathetic incident of the demoniac boy with the distracted father and the impotent disciples. And this again by, "Let these words sink into your hearts: for the Son of Man shall be delivered up into the hands of men."

He weeps aloud (xix. 41) at the sight of the holy city, which kills the prophets (xiii. 34), from whose eyes the things of her own peace are hid. The testament, or covenant, which He has desired with a great desire (xxii. 15) to seal with His disciples before His suffering, is sealed with His own blood. Before the coming of the kingdom in which He shall drink the new wine of Resurrection with His regenerated friends, a body must be broken on a cross, and blood poured out in death. The denial of Peter is touched by S. Luke with a peculiar pathos. He alone tells us (xxii. 61) that "the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter." And lastly, after the Resurrection, when Our Lord expounded to the two disciples the things which were written of Himself in Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms, and opened their mind that they might understand the scriptures, He said "thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer."

One special element in the burden that lay upon the Master's heart, as it lay afterwards upon the heart of His great Apostle, was His rejection by His own people.[1] S. Luke does not pretend that the actual message of the Galilean Jesus was addressed to any but the house of Israel: his own universalism appears only in an allusion here and there. But his Gospel describes the preparation for that inevitable time when an ardent patriot, whose maxim was "to the Jew first," was driven to exclaim, "seeing therefore that ye thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo! we turn to the Gentiles" (Acts xiii. 46). The rejection by the Nazarenes (iv. 29) and the failure of

[1] Dr. Latimer Jackson finds the "note of pessimism" in words which "tell of members of His own nation excluded from the Kingdom" (e.g. Lk. xiii. 28) (*Eschatology of Jesus*, p. 46).

the purpose that would have gathered the children of Jerusalem as a hen gathereth her own brood under her wings, are the beginning and the end of the remorseless chain of sorrows that make Our Lord say, with the pregnant pathos of one who faces facts and yet refuses to impair the freedom of the human conscience, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith upon the earth?" (xviii. 8).

These, then, are elements in S. Luke's picture of the Lord. It remains only to shew how the sons of men were drawn to Him, how it came to pass that "all the people hung upon Him to hear Him" (xix. 48).

The Evangelist's own approach is clearly seen. His personal affinities are with the ascetic side of Our Lord's life and teaching. S. Paul had emphasized this aspect. Partly perhaps because he so understood the Gospel, but more because he believed that he was writing with the End almost in sight, he had bidden his converts stand loose from earthly ties.[1] And S. Luke's sympathies are with the "virgin daughters, which did prophesy" (Acts xxi. 9), with the devout widow watching unto prayer, with those who are driven by the all-absorbing violence of vocation to separate themselves from earthly bonds and to "hate," as he puts it, their father and their mother[2]: "So therefore whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple" (xiv. 33); "Give for alms those things that ye can; and, behold, all things are clean unto you" (xi. 41); "Sell

[1] It must always be remembered that although nearly all S. Paul's moral teaching is entirely independent of eschatology (see p. 34), the inadequate conception of marriage in 1 Cor. vii. (see especially *vv.* 2 and 9) is due to "the present distress" (26), and because "the time is shortened" (29) (cp. Lk. xxi. 34–36, xxiii. 29, xvii. 28). A much more worthy doctrine is found in Eph. v. 25–33. On the subject of asceticism in S. Luke's Gospel it may be remarked that if the Evangelist has learned some of it from S. Paul, he has learned from the same teacher that to be of any value it must be free. Is it too hazardous, for example, to suggest that the Lukan wording of v. 34 ("Can ye *make* the sons of the bridechamber to fast?") is affected by recollection of some indignant Pauline denunciation of the legal spirit? Mt. ix. 15 has "Can the sons of the bridechamber fast?" It must be admitted that some of the early Christians were a little wooden about their fasting. The *Didache* enjoins (chap. viii), "Let not your fastings be with the hypocrites, for they fast on the second and fifth day of the week, but do ye keep your fast on the fourth and the preparation (the sixth) day."

[2] The difficulty of determining what exactly is meant by "hating" father and mother is in one sense increased, but is also mitigated, when it is observed that the disciple is required to hate "his own soul also." It is significant that Lk. alone adds here "and wife" (xiv. 26). So also in xiv. 23 he alone records the injunction to go out "into the highways and hedges." Cp. Deut. xxxiii. 9.

that ye have, and give alms; make for yourselves purses which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not" (xii. 33). S. Luke has in common with the other Evangelists the stories of the rich young man,[1] and the widow's mite, but he alone records Our Lord's injunction to invite the poor, the maimed, the halt, and the blind, who will be unable to return the hospitality (xiv. 12–15); he alone relates the warning of the backsliding worldliness of Lot's wife (xvii. 32), and how Our Lord obtained from the disciples the admission (xxii. 35) that, when He sent them forth without purse or wallet or shoes, they had lacked nothing. The Lukan parables include the Good Samaritan, Dives and Lazarus, the Importunate Widow. His version of the Beatitudes blesses those who suffer actual hunger and are physically poor,[2] and he adds to them "Woes" upon the rich, the full, those who laugh now and those of whom all men speak well (vi. 20–26). It is not fair to call his Gospel "Ebionite," if the term is intended to involve a condemnation of all property, but in general the Lukan way, if I may borrow Mr. Stephen Graham's title, is the way of Mary rather than the way of Martha.

Again, it is well known that his references to Our Lord as praying are far more numerous than those of the other Gospels. There are no less than seven allusions peculiar to S. Luke. Of these, the "Ember prayer" ("He went up into the mountain to pray, and he continued all night in prayer to God. And when it

[1] Origen has preserved the following addition to the story: "Another rich man said to Him, 'Master, what good thing shall I do to live?' He said to him, 'O man, fulfil the Law and the Prophets.' He answered Him, 'I have fulfilled them.' He said to him, 'Go, sell all that thou possessest, and come follow Me.' But the rich man began to scratch his head, and it did not please him. And the Lord said to him, 'How sayest thou, I have fulfilled the Law and the Prophets, since it is written in the Law, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself; and lo! many of thy brethren, sons of Abraham, are clothed in filth, dying of hunger; and thy house is full of many goods, and nothing at all goes out of it to them? And he turned and said to Simon his disciple, who was sitting by Him, 'Simon, son of John, it is easier for a camel to enter the eye of a needle than for a rich man [to enter] into the kingdom of heaven'" (*Comm. on S. Matthew*, tom. xvi. 14).

[2] The supposed difficulty of this is eased by two considerations: (1) The constant use in the Prophets and Psalms of the term "poor" in the sense of "godly poor" implies that S. Luke's "poor" is probably not very different in meaning from S. Matthew's "poor in spirit"; (2) Dr. Stanton, who considers that the Lukan form is the more original, says: "In St. Luke the gesture described at the beginning of the discourse—'He lifted up His eyes upon His disciples and said'—and the direct address to them throughout should be noticed [i.e. 'Blessed are ye poor, etc.']; it is not all the poor who are blessed, but Christ's disciples, *although* they are poor" (*Gospels*, etc., ii, p. 107).

was day, he called his disciples ; and he chose from them twelve, whom also he named apostles," vi. 12), and the Lukan setting of the Paternoster (" And it came to pass, as he was praying in a certain place, that when he ceased, one of his disciples said to him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples " (xi. 1)), are the most important.[1] Three of the " Lukan only " parables, the Friend at midnight (xi. 5–8), the Unjust Judge (xviii. 1–8), and the Publican (xviii. 9–14) are parables of prayer.

Closely connected with his ascetic sympathies,[2] but perhaps less Pauline, is the place which he assigns to women. It is perhaps not always realized that S. Luke tells us all we know about Elizabeth, Anna, the mother at Nain (vii. 11), Joanna, who ministered to Jesus of her substance (viii. 3), the sentimental woman in the crowd, who exclaimed, " Blessed is the womb that bare thee " (xi. 27), the " daughter of Abraham, whom Satan had bound, lo ! these eighteen years," who was healed with the touching words, " Thou art loosed from thine infirmity " (xiii. 12), the widow whose continued pleading won even the unrighteous judge (xviii. 3), the woman, in the parable, who lost the piece of silver (xv. 8), and the women, the daughters of Jerusalem, who bewailed and lamented on the road to Calvary (xxiii. 28). From S. Luke we learn a great deal of what we know about the Virgin Mother and about Martha and Mary. In the story, related by all four Evangelists, of the woman who anointed Our Lord with the precious ointment, many of the most familiar features, the fact that the woman was a sinner, the contempt of the Pharisee, the whole story of the two forgiven debtors and the " greater love," are found only in S. Luke (vii. 36–50).[3]

Apart from these special points there are many indications of

[1] The others are iii. 21 (the Baptism), v. 16, ix. 18 (before the Confession of S. Peter), ix. 28 (the Transfiguration), and xxii. 32 (" Simon, Simon . . . I prayed for thee ").

[2] See F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History*, pp. 214–215 : " We must never forget that Christian asceticism has generally tended towards the equalization of the sexes. . . . And so the Gospel which most strikes the ascetic note is also that which tells us most of the part played by women in the Gospel history."

[3] Perplexing features of this narrative are that S. John twice over (xi. 2, xii. 3) says that this woman was Mary of Bethany, and also that, while S. Luke relates the incident as early as the seventh chapter, all the other Evangelists assign it to the last week. There is no evidence for the common identification of S. Luke's " woman who was a sinner " with Mary Magdalene. In fact, the mention of her a few verses later (viii. 2) makes the identification rather particularly difficult.

the Pauline tinge of his belief. His use of Pauline words like "repentance" and "grace" [1] is but a small part of the evidence. The whole Gospel is Pauline. He begins his genealogy not, as S. Matthew, from Abraham, the father of the Jews, but from Adam, the father of humanity. His Christ is a light to lighten the Gentiles; He has one law for the home-born and the foreigner, for the Jew and the Samaritan alike. It was his Gospel which Marcion, the second-century anti-Semitic "Paulinist" who believed that the whole history of the Jews was of the devil, adapted to fit his curious purpose. But, on the other hand, it required considerable adapting.[2] For, like S. Paul, our Evangelist could never forget that salvation was given in the first instance through the Jewish Church. He could appreciate the charm of the picturesque old Judaism which he describes in his first two chapters, and his parable of the unfruitful but regenerated fig-tree (xiii. 6–9) is one of many that shew his belief that Judaism still had a chance.

In various passages he sketches what he clearly intends to be the typical relations between the believer and the Lord. The tone is very Pauline. There is, for example, v. 1–11, the story of the call of Peter, already noticed in connexion with the interpretation of Professor Schmiedel. The attitude of Peter, who falls down at Jesus' knees, saying, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord," is the inevitable and proper attitude. Only thus can man hope to hear the reassuring message, which is withheld till then, that there is no need to be afraid; because he has been a humble servant, the Master will make him a great prince; because he had bravely faced the facts of his own soul, he shall

[1] Of this the best examples are vi. 32 (33, 34), where for S. Matthew's "What reward have ye?" he substitutes "What grace have ye?" and v. 32, where in the saying, "I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance," the last two words belong, according to the true text, to S. Luke only. In vi. 36 he substitutes "pitiful" for S. Matthew's "perfect," and in viii. 12 he adds a Pauline touch, "believe and be saved." There is perhaps a Pauline ring about the form of the saying recorded in xviii. 8, "shall he find faith on the earth?" about the repeated "thy faith hath saved thee" (vii. 50, viii. 48, xvii. 19, xviii. 42), and the substitution of "unfaithful" in xii. 46 for the "hypocrites" of Mt. xxiv. 51.

[2] The version of S. Luke's Gospel which Marcion constructed can be reproduced almost exactly from the comments of Tertullian (*Adv. Marcionem*). He omitted about 300 verses, i.e. the first three chapters (except iii. 1) and various other sections of which he disapproved. Some, e.g. xi. 29–32 (Jonah), are for obvious reasons, but it is less easy to see why he left out the Parable of the Prodigal Son. See Sanday, *Gospels in the Second Century*, chap. viii, and Burkitt, *Gospel History*, chap. ix.

win the souls of others. And further, when once the great surrender has been made and the great promise heard, it is possible to forsake all and follow, even though a thousand questions are still unanswered. The principle that justifies so wild an adventure is the Pauline principle that "Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will perform" (1 Thess. v. 24). The parable (in xvii. 7) of the master who makes his servant wait upon him and only then serve himself sounds at first rather harsh. It seems, moreover, that the servant must not expect, and the master is not required to give, any thanks for what is done. But the point is the thoroughly Pauline point that the relation of God and man is not a bargain. There is no question of earning or deserving. It is "not of works." It is an affair, from end to end, of grace. The initial fact, the undeserved miracle, is that God has had mercy on a sinner.[1] And so in the end the servants are left saying, "We have established no kind of claim. It is all the free, gracious gift of God. We are unprofitable servants. We have only done that which we were bound in our Christian honour to perform."[2]

No sketch of the Lukan conception of the relations between God and man would be complete without some reference to the Parable of the Prodigal Son. If the story of the Wicked Husbandmen (xx. 9) is, in an historical sense, the Gospel in brief, yet homiletically and spiritually the title of *Evangelium in evangelio* must be assigned to the Prodigal Son. The only parable that could dispute is perhaps the Good Samaritan. Both are found in S. Luke only. In the story of the Prodigal (xv. 11) it has been sometimes noticed that there is apparently no atonement.[3] Sir Oliver Lodge, for instance, has remarked that there seems to be no feeling on the part of the father which has to be "removed by

[1] Cp. the unsparing truthfulness of ἠλεημένος in 1 Cor. vii. 25. Most men would have used some word like "chosen."

[2] Cp. Du Bose on the parable of the Pharisee and Publican, "No man who knows what righteousness is will come into God's presence with a claim of his own to it. And if he does, so far from the claim being recognized, it will be the one disqualification for the reality to which it pretends. . . . We see already in Our Lord's parable the precise and entire principle which in St. Paul we find developed into the doctrine of justification by faith" (*The Gospel according to St. Paul*, p. 71, 73). In this connexion it may be noted that in x. 29 and xvi. 15 "justify" is used in the Pauline sense. Also that the apparent harshness of the actual parable mentioned in the text is mitigated by the reversal of parts indicated in xii. 37 and xxii. 27.

[3] "All the dogmatic dreams of the upholders of an atonement by blood vanish, like oppressive nightmares, before this single parable" ("A German Rationalist," quoted by Trench, *Parables*, p. 409).

expiatory sacrifice or by propitiation of any kind. . . . There is very little residue of the Mosaic dispensation in that story."[1] But this, even apart from the error of supposing that sacrificial ideas are wholly Jewish, surely presupposes an unworthy and impossible doctrine of Atonement. For, unless we are to accept the pestilential theology of Milton, the Atonement is the action of the Father's love. "While he was yet afar off, his father saw him, and was moved with compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him." What is this but the Pauline doctrine: "Peradventure for the good man some one would even dare to die. But God commendeth his own love for us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for the ungodly" (Rom. v. 7, 8)? Or again: "God was reconciling the world unto himself in the person of Christ" (2 Cor. v. 19).[2] The Cross is the actual revelation of the Love of God the Father.[3]

This Paulinism is brought out in many of the minor incidents of the Gospel. A man appeals to Our Lord (xii. 13) to make his brother divide his inheritance with him. And the reply is: "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you? Take heed, and keep yourselves from covetousness." The request is for legalism. "Lay down mechanical rules, which we can carry away, keep in our pockets, and use for eight hours a day." But the answer is that grace is not a thing that you can keep in your pocket. It is new every morning, and it comes, fresh-made, from God in heaven. It is, in fact, the Gospel, as contrasted with the law. The parable of the Rich Fool (xii. 16) is the lesson that there never comes a time when you can say, "I have served God enough. I will rest now and take my ease." But rather, "I

[1] *Hibbert Journal*, October 1904, p. 19. In fact, he adds: "So markedly has this been felt indeed by some preachers that, in dismay at finding themselves adrift from their familiar moorings, a few have actually seized upon the fatted calf, and tried to construct some kind of propitiatory sacrifice out of that." I have not myself met with any modern instance of this curious exegesis, though it occurs in Origen (*Hom. I. in Lev.*). Augustine says, "*Tunc enim cuique* [*Christus*] *occiditur, cum credit occisum.*"

[2] I paraphrase the familiar words thus, in order to avoid seeming to suggest that S. Paul means "God was in Christ, reconciling," etc. I do not think that S. Paul would have shrunk from saying that God was in Christ. But he is not here laying down any formal doctrine of Incarnation, only appealing to the Atoning Love of God.

[3] "The Collect for the Sunday before Easter might have been formed upon the parable of the Prodigal Son; there is no sufficient commentary upon that parable but the Cross itself. [The whole week] is either a dream, or it is a translation into fact of this parable" (F. D. Maurice, *The Kingdom of Heaven*, pp. 233, 243).

count not myself yet to have apprehended. . . . I press on towards the goal" (Phil. iii. 13). It cannot be alleged for a moment that S. Luke disparages good works. But, with S. Paul, he thinks of them rather as a fruit and consequence than as a deserving merit. It is Mary who is more abundantly justified than Martha, and that by faith.

CHAPTER IX

THE SOURCES OF THE GOSPEL (1)

No one who examines the three Synoptic Gospels can fail to see that they stand in some relation to one another. They agree, in the selection and order of events, and in a good many of the actual words, for pages at a time. Thus, for example, (1) the passage Mk. ii. 13–22 is reproduced almost exactly in Mt. ix. 9–17 and Lk. v. 27–38, the only substantial difference being that Mt. inserts a reference to the Old Testament in ix. 13. Again (2), to take a rather longer passage, Mk. viii. 27–ix. 37 appears in Mt. xvi. 13–xviii. 5 and in Lk. ix. 18–48. The only material differences are that (*a*) Mt. makes two characteristic additions (xvi. 17–19 and xvii. 24–27) and Lk. one (ix. 31), (*b*) both Evangelists omit a touch (Mk. ix. 3) which would not seem nearly so important to them as it does to us, and a question (Mk. ix. 21) over which they perhaps feared that their readers might stumble,[1] and (*c*) Lk. compresses the whole narrative and also omits the rebuke addressed to Peter (Mk. viii. 32, 33) and the conversation about Elijah (Mk. ix. 11–13). It is important to note that this second illustrative passage includes the first and second predictions of the Passion, both of which appear in the same order and context in all three Gospels. Finally (3), the third and last prediction of the Passion appears in the same relative position in a third passage, which is practically identical in all three (Mk. x. 13–52; Mt. xix. 13–xx. 34; Lk. xviii. 15–43), the only differences here being that Mt. inserts (xx. 1–16) a parable which suits his general purpose, as having an obvious reference to the Jews, and Lk.

[1] Other questions (Mk. vi. 38, viii. 12, ix. 33) are either omitted by S. Luke or turned in another way. (See Lk. ix. 13, xi. 29, ix. 47). The only exception appears to be Lk. viii. 45, though it is not quite certain that this is intended to be a real question asked for information.

characteristically omits the ambitious request of James and John, and their rebuke.[1]

So much for the identity of subject-matter and order. For the identity of actual wording one striking example will suffice. The healing of a paralysed man is thus recorded in the three Synoptic Gospels :

Mk. ii. 9–11.	Mt. ix. 5–6.	Lk. v. 23–24.
Which is easier ?	*For* which is easier	Which is easier,
To say *to the paralytic*, thy sins are forgiven thee, or to say, Arise *and take up thy bed* and walk ?	To say, Thy sins are forgiven thee, or to say, Arise and walk ?	To say, Thy sins are forgiven thee, or to say, Arise and walk ?
But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath authority to forgive sins on earth—	But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath authority on earth to forgive sins—	But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath authority on earth to forgive sins—
He saith to the paralytic, I say unto thee, Arise.	*Then* saith he to the paralytic, Arise.	He *said* to the *paralysed man*, I say unto thee, Arise.

We have here as near an approach to verbal agreement as is possible in writers who are not simple copyists. The changes of word, indicated by the use of italics, or of order of words, indicated by dots, are trifling, and, if space permitted, could be explained in practically every case by reference to the known literary habits of the several writers. But the measure of identity is astonishing, and, most remarkable of all, the three Evangelists actually agree in the somewhat unusual grammatical structure of a sentence. All three break off the spoken word, " but that ye may know," etc., by a return to narrative, " he saith " (Lk. " said "), in precisely the same way. Many other cases of identity of language, only one degree less striking, could be mentioned.

These instances make it unquestionable that the Synoptic Gospels stand in some relation to one another. What then is the relation ?

What is called the Oral Theory will take us along part only of the way. It is pointed out quite truly that Oriental memories are very retentive, and that the Rabbinic teachers had attached great importance to oral methods and had even a certain distrust

[1] S. Luke gives the teaching of this section in other connexions. See xii. 50 and xxii. 25, 26.

of the written word.[1] Moreover it is undeniable that Peter and other Apostles, if they were accustomed to relate various parts of the story of their Master's life again and again, might very naturally come in course of time to relate them always in more or less the same words. Finally, it is suggested that catechists would probably be trained for their work by learning the narrative and the words of the Lord by heart. There is not much specific evidence for the existence of a regular order of Catechists, but it appears that Theophilus had been "catechized" (i. 4) in a preliminary way[2]; the word is also used of the initial instruction of Apollos in Acts xviii. 25; S. Paul refers (Rom. xii. 7; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11) to "teachers"; S. Mark, who is said by Papias to have been the "interpreter" of S. Peter, may well have been a sort of catechist under the direction of the Apostle; and S. Luke may perhaps have discharged the same function for S. Paul. In this way it has been suggested that a stereotyped form grew up.

The Oral Theory does carry us a certain part of the way. As Westcott says: "The experience of oral teaching was required to bring within the reach of writing the vast subject of the life of Christ. . . . But of the countless multitude of Christ's acts those were selected and arranged . . . which were seen to have the fullest representative significance for the exhibition of His divine life."[3] So Schmeidel, who considers that the adoption of the oral theory as a complete explanation is either an *asylum ignorantiae* or an *asylum orthodoxiae*, admits that "it contains an essential element of truth. Unquestionably, the formation of a Gospel narrative was oral in its beginning."[4] Sir John Hawkins has collected a number of cases in which various features (e.g. the attribution of the same or like words to different speakers, the use of the same or like words now as part of a speech and

[1] Edersheim refers to Rabbinic judgments to the effect that the ordinances of the Scribes were "more precious and more binding than those of Holy Scripture itself" (*Life and Times*, ii, p. 15). For references to passages illustrating the capacity of Oriental memories see Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, p. 54 n.

[2] Though Blass (*Philology of the Gospels*, p. 20) maintains that this need only mean "informed." Cp. Acts xxi. 21, where it is used of (mistaken) information. So on Acts xviii. 25 Blass supposes (p. 31 n.) that Apollos had had a book read aloud to him by a slave.

[3] *Introd. to Study of Gospels*, p. 169, 170.

[4] *Encycl. Bibl.*, ii, 1846.

now as part of the narrative, and transpositions of order) appear to indicate the influence of oral tradition.[1]

The truth probably is that as long as Christianity remained a Palestinian religion, the tradition remained either wholly or predominantly oral. Even to this day it has never become—except by reason of comparatively modern misunderstandings—a "book-religion." Least of all was it a book-religion in Palestinian times. It also appears certain that a good deal of oral tradition survived side by side with the written Gospels. There is, for example, the quotation in Acts xx. 35, and other traditionally recorded sayings not found in the Gospels. And there are peculiarities in the quotations of the Apostolic Fathers of which the simplest explanation in some cases is that they were influenced by tradition.

It is, however, generally agreed that the oral theory will not by itself explain all the facts. It will explain some of the resemblances and some of the differences, but it will not explain the remarkable combination of resemblance and difference which is presented by the Gospels.[2] It certainly will not explain the particular phenomena quoted above (p. 123). Nor will it explain an interesting item in the Synoptic material, in referring to which I must anticipate to some extent the argument that follows in the text (p. 136 f.). I mean what are called "doublets," i.e. passages of S. Matthew or of S. Luke which occur twice in the same Gospel. On the oral theory, it seems certain that an Evangelist, finding a passage for the second time among his traditional material, would omit it, on the ground that he had recorded it once already. It may perhaps seem strange that he has not omitted it the second time in any case. But it is the fact that he has not. Doublets exist, and the most probable explanation of them is that the Evangelist (S. Matthew or S. Luke) found one member of the doublet in his main source, i.e. S. Mark, and

[1] *Horae Synopticae*, 2nd ed., Pt. II, §§ 2, 3.

[2] "I am not denying the retentive capacity of Oriental memories, so often invoked by the defenders of an oral hypothesis; but if our evangelists had worked upon a fixed oral tradition of this definite sort, I cannot imagine why they dared to take such liberties with it. A definite oral tradition is authoritative: can we conceive of an oral tradition which accurately distinguishes between the *baskets* of fragments taken up after the feeding of the 5000, and the *hampers* taken up after feeding the 4000, but which left the details of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection vague?" (Burkitt, *Two Lectures on the Gospels*, p. 45; cp. *The Gospel History*, etc., pp. 145 f.).

the other in some other source. As a matter of fact, where there are doublets, it is found almost always that one occurs in the Markan narrative and the other in a portion of the Gospels which on other grounds is commonly assigned to Q. Examples of Lukan doublets are (1) viii. 18 and xix. 26, (2) ix. 23, 24, and xvii. 33, (3) xi. 43, and xx. 46. A famous Matthæan doublet is Mt. v. 32 and xix. 9. The absence of "triplets," except the proverbial saying, "He that hath ears, let him hear" (Mt. xi. 15, xiii. 9, 43), "seems to indicate that there were only two main sources." [1]

Finally, the word "many" in Lk. i. 1 does not suggest the existence of an overwhelming prejudice against any kind of writing. On the whole it must be said that the more extreme advocates of the oral theory have a mistaken and somewhat anachronistic notion of what really happened.

It is clear that eventually Gospels were written; and the period of writing began before the compilation of the Gospels that we have. For a complete explanation of the facts of the Gospels, some documentary hypothesis is essential. The remainder of this chapter and the next are occupied with a brief account of the most commonly received form of such a hypothesis. Confining ourselves to the supposed sources of S. Luke, we may assert with some confidence that his first source was:

1. The Markan Source.[2]

As between S. Mark and S. Luke there is no doubt which way the dependence runs. It is one of the thoroughly established results of Synoptic criticism, which has been extraordinarily careful and minute, that both the other Synoptic Evangelists used

[1] *Horae Synopticae*, 2nd ed., p. 82.

[2] There can be no doubt that S. Luke was personally acquainted with S. Mark. The separation of the latter from S. Paul (Acts xiii. 13) occurred before the companionship of S. Paul and S. Luke appears to have begun. But the two Evangelists are heard of together at a later date. In fact, on the only three occasions on which S. Luke is named in the New Testament (Col. iv. 10–14; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 10) S. Mark is mentioned too. Harnack (*Luke the Physician*, p. 158) is of opinion that S. Luke is somewhat prejudiced against S. Mark. He does not name him in his Preface. He "wrote his Gospel in order to supplant the Gospel of S. Mark," and further in Acts "the only apostolic man about whom something unpleasant is therein recorded is S. Mark." The first point is without significance; the second would apply equally to S. Matthew, and is so qualified by Harnack ("in the sense, at least, in which every author writing after another author on the same subject intends to supersede the work of his predecessor") as to make it worthless; for the third point, see above, p. 83, n. 1.

S. Mark, and not *vice versa*. This is proved in the following way. The facts are, briefly, these: (*a*) Practically the whole of Mk. is contained in either Mt. or Lk., and a very large part in both. On the other hand, both Mt. and Lk. have much that is not in Mk. (*b*) As has been pointed out already, there is in all three Gospels a large measure of identity in structure and order of events. Finally, (*c*) Mk. again and again agrees verbally with Mt. against Lk. and almost as frequently with Lk. against Mt., but Mt. and Lk. very seldom agree together against Mk. In other words, where there is verbal agreement between two, Mk. is nearly always one of the agreeing pair. As far as the narrative is concerned, he is the link or common element in the triple tradition.

These, then, are the facts. What is their bearing on the case for the priority of Mk.? In the first place, (*a*) it is hard indeed to see how S. Mark could have consented to omit the additional matter of Mt. and Lk., if he had had it before him. Next, (*b*) "the order followed by all three Synoptists is, generally speaking, that of Mark with its greater simplicity as compared with the more elaborate and sometimes artificial grouping of the First and Third Evangelists. If the latter part company from Mark's order, they invariably return to it; when one or other temporarily forsakes it, a reason is not far to seek; when both forsake it, they invariably differ among themselves."[1] Finally, (*c*) it is quite impossible that S. Mark in compiling his Gospel should have either desired or been able to construct a narrative which should consist in great part of just those sections, and often of just those very words, which happened to be common to Mt. and Lk., and yet should be a natural, straightforward and even spirited narrative.[2]

It is, then, as certain as anything can be, that S. Matthew and S. Luke had before them, and made use of, a source which was

[1] Dr. Latimer Jackson in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 438. After the Appointment of the Twelve (Mk. iii. 13–19*a* = Mt. x. 1–4 = Lk. vi. 12–16) Mt. and Lk. both go on independently of Mk. and with considerable differences between themselves as to both matter and arrangement until Mt. at xiii. 1 and Lk. at viii. 4 resume the Markan order with the Parable of the Sower (Mk. iv. 1). An even more obvious example is that whereas the *exordia* of the two later Evangelists are independent, they begin to agree, with one another and with Mk., at the point when Mk. begins.

[2] This was put once for all in Dr. Abbott's *Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels*, p. vii. See also a lucid treatment of the subject by F. H. Woods in *Studia Biblica*, vol. ii.

identical or practically identical with what we now call the Gospel of S. Mark.

The use of the word "practically" requires some explanation. It is sometimes thought that there were two (if not three) editions of S. Mark, our present version being the latest. This theory appears in two forms:

(*a*) It is suggested that S. Matthew and S. Luke both used one of the earlier editions, i.e. what is sometimes called *Ur-Markus*.

It was said above that whereas there are constant agreements of Mk., Mt. against Lk., and of Mk., Lk. against Mt., there are very few cases of Mt., Lk. agreeing against Mk. It is obvious that if there were many important cases of such agreement it would become impossible to believe that S. Matthew and S. Luke did what they are commonly supposed to have done, i.e. made independent but identical use of the Markan document in its present form. For it is exceedingly improbable that in any great number of cases they would have hit on the same variation, and it would then seem certain that they both had before them some version of S. Mark different from that which we know.

Now, as a matter of fact, there are (1) a few negative agreements of Mt. and Lk. against Mk., i.e. the two Evangelists, in retelling a Markan story, from time to time agree in leaving out some of those vivid and picturesque touches which are commonly thought to be recollections of S. Peter. But it is, as a rule, not difficult to assign reasons for these omissions. A case in point is Mk. vi. 39, where Mt. and Lk. have not repeated the observation that the groups of people sitting on the *green* grass were like a series of *flower-beds*. Other instances of much the same kind, where a Markan (and perhaps Petrine) detail is omitted as unnecessary, are Mk. i. 20 ("with the hired servants"), iv. 38 ("on the pillow"), v. 41 ("Taleitha Koum"), ix. 36 ("Taking them up in his arms"), x. 16 (as ix. 36), x. 22 ("his face fell"), xiv. 51, 52 (the episode of the young man [S. Mark himself ?] in the garden), xiv. 59 ("and even so their witness was not satisfactory"), and xv. 21 ("the father of Alexander and Rufus"). In all these cases it must be remembered that S. Matthew and S. Luke would not value the realistic element, the vivid touch that indicates the eye-witness, as we do nowadays.

Examples in which the later Evangelists correct some mistake or polish some literary roughness in Mk. are: Mk. i. 10 ("rent asunder"), ii. 4 (the curious and perhaps unhistorical mention of "digging through" the roof),[1] ii. 10 (the word for "bed," which is believed to be a vulgarism), ii. 26 (the mistaken reference to Abiathar—see 1 Sam. xxi. 1), v. 23 ("is at the point of death"—a vulgarism in Greek), viii. 12 ("no sign shall be given"—a curious Hebraism), xiv. 3 (the improbable statement that an alabaster vessel was "broken"), xiv. 30 ("twice"—cf. xiv. 72, "a second time"), xiv. 72 (the obscure word ἐπιβαλών, of which the meaning is not really known), and xv. 25 ("the third hour").

Among the cases where the omission by S. Matthew and S. Luke may perhaps be assigned to mistaken theological circumspection [2] are Mk. iii. 5 ("with anger," and "being grieved"),

[1] Ramsay, however, explains this by saying that "Mark ii. 4 describes how the bearers stripped off the covering of clay and soil . . . broke a hole in the ceiling, and let down the bed through it. This description was true of the simple Palestinian hut, but was unintelligible to a person who knew only the houses of a Greek or a Roman city. Luke adapts his account of the incident (not to a Greek house, but) to a Roman house" (*Luke the Physician*, etc., p. 46).

[2] It is easy for modern Christians to talk of mistaken circumspection. How natural and inevitable the process was will appear from the following words of Archdeacon Allen: "It is evident that contemplation of the life of the Lord, and reflection upon His Person and work, and all that it meant for human life; and the deepening reverence that springs spontaneously from the life of meditation upon His words, and from spiritual communion with Him, and from worship of God in His name, was gradually leading Christian writers partly to refine and purify, partly to make careful choice of the language with which they described His life. In connexion with His Sacred Person the choicest words only must be used, choicest not for splendour or for beauty of sound or of suggestion, but as conveying in the simplest and most direct way the greatest amount of truth about Him with the least admixture of wrong emphasis. In this respect the Synoptic Gospels present in miniature the same process that afterwards took place on a larger scale in the history of the creeds. Already the Gospel writers found themselves committed to the task of describing the life of one whom they knew to have been a truly human person, whom yet they believed to have been an incarnation of the Eternal. This task, in which it could never be possible to attain more than a relative amount of success, was increased by the fact that the books to be written were intended not for Christians with years of Christian thought and instruction to soften apparent inconsistencies, nor for men trained in the art of so softening the intellectual paradoxes of life as to escape from mental paralysis, but for the average member of the Christian congregation, simple-minded and matter-of-fact, to whom the narrative of the Lord's life with its double-sidedness would repeatedly suggest hard questions, until use and custom blunted their edge. How could the Lord, if He was divine, ask for information? How could He wish or will things that did not happen? How could it be said that He could not do this or that? Did God really forsake Him in the garden? Could it be that He had prayed a prayer which was unfulfilled? Was it possible that S. Peter had rebuked Him? Why was He baptized if baptism implied repentance and forgiveness of sin? The first and third Gospels prove themselves to be later than the second by the consideration which they show

iii. 21 (" they said, He is beside himself "), iv. 38 (" Carest thou not "), vi. 3 (" the carpenter "), x. 14 (" was indignant "), xi. 13 (" the time of figs was not yet "), xiv. 33 (" sore amazed "), xv. 44 (" Pilate marvelled that he should be dead already "), xv. 45 (" corpse "), and finally the two miracles peculiar to S. Mark (vii. 31–37 and viii. 22–25).[1]

It is difficult to assign a reason for the omission (especially by Lk.) of Mk. ii. 27 (" The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath "), though Mt. has here (xii. 5–7) a special addition, and in S. Luke D (Codex Bezæ) inserts after vi. 4, " the same day, having seen a man working on the sabbath, he said to him, Man if thou knowest what thou doest, blessed art thou, but if thou knowest not thou art accursed and a transgressor of the law." It is noticeable that D omits Mk. ii. 27.

It will be seen that most of these negative agreements can be explained. But there are also (2) some passages in which Mt. and Lk. do positively agree in their wording against Mk. Dr. E. A. Abbott has found 230 cases of this, Sir John Hawkins about 240.[2] It seems a large number, but the great proportion of them are very tiny, e.g. they are cases of the Markan "historic present," which is avoided by the other Evangelists, especially S. Luke; others are portions of words; others are substitutions of δέ for καί, etc. Sir John Hawkins [3] is of opinion that only twenty or twenty-one cases are of any real importance. These passages are all quite short, and except in this particular connexion of the two-edition theory of S. Mark, the differences are quite unimportant. One example, the most interesting of them all, is Mk. xiv. 65 (the first mocking of Our Lord by the Temple servants), wherein Mk. has simply " Prophesy," and both the other Evangelists add, " Who is he that smote thee ? " [4] The importance of such positive agreements against Mk. is, of course, this. Unless it can be shewn that the two later Evangelists would quite naturally make

for the simple-minded reader in questions like these, and it is quite possible that Mt. and Lk. may often have agreed on a quite independent version of Mk. in these respects " (*Comm. on S. Matthew*, p. xxxviii).

[1] For S. Luke's reasons for omitting these, see p. 133.

[2] *The Corrections of Mark*, App. I.; *Horae Synopticae*, App. B.

[3] *Horae Synopticae*, 2nd ed., p. 210 f. See also Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 42–58; C. H. Turner in *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, Jan. 1909, p. 174 f.

[4] Mt. has " Prophesy *unto us, O Christ*, who is he that smote thee."

the same correction independently, or might quite naturally hit upon the same variation independently, it would seem that they must have had before them (if we remember the closeness with which they elsewhere follow their original) some slightly different edition of Mk. from that known to us. As a matter of fact, the application of the most modern principles of Textual Criticism has the effect of reducing the number of these cases to sixteen,[1] and the remainder can be explained without excessive ingenuity. The only one that presents any difficulty is that quoted above. If there were several like it, they would constitute a case. But it stands alone. Even in this case it is not difficult to imagine the two later Evangelists filling up a not very clear sentence in the same way. On the whole, many scholars find no difficulty in concluding that S. Matthew's and S. Luke's editions of S. Mark were the same as ours.[2]

(*b*) The other form of the theory is one that more particularly concerns S. Luke. It is supposed that he at least used a different version of S. Mark's Gospel, because in one place (after ix. 17) he leaves out about a chapter and a half (Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26), a section of which S. Matthew contains everything except Mk. vii 31–37 and viii. 22–26. This omission would perhaps be most simply explained by postulating an earlier and later edition of Mk., but inasmuch as no difference of style is discernible between this section and the remainder of the Gospel,[3] we are led to consider other possible explanations. I reproduce here the argument of Sir John Hawkins.[4]

(1) It may have been simply an accident. There is, as it happens, a mention of feeding and also a mention of Bethsaida, both at the beginning and at the end of the section (vi. 44 and

[1] E.g. in Mk. v. 27 = Mt. ix. 20 = Lk. viii. 44 the received texts of both Mt. and Lk. turn "his garment" into "the border of His garment." But the true reading in Lk. is perhaps "his garment."

[2] A few other cases, from which the reader will be able to draw his own conclusions, are: Mk. vi. 14, where Mt. and Lk. substitute "Tetrarch" for "king"; Mk. ix. 19, where they add "and perverse" after "faithless," an addition which obviously comes from Deut. xxxii. 5; cp. Phil. ii. 15.

[3] Hawkins in *Oxford Studies*, pp. 63–66.

[4] In *Oxford Studies*, pp. 63–74, an argument of which Dr. Sanday (*ibid.*, p. xii) says: "I am myself inclined to regard as a classical treatment of the subject." But it must be noted that Dr. Stanton maintains (*Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii. p. 156 f.) that considerable portions of the section were not in the version of S. Mark used by S. Luke. So also Mr. N. P. Williams in *Oxford Studies*, p. 418 f.

viii. 14–21, vi. 45 and viii. 22), and it is possible that S. Luke, using his original, may have been misled by this and have gone on, after an interval, at the wrong place. It must be remembered that the ancient book had no chapters and verses, and if a copyist or reader once lost his place it was much harder for him to find it again than it is for us.

(2) It is also possible that S. Luke, knowing that he had other material to incorporate, purposely omitted this section, in order that he might not exceed the traditional length of an ancient book. It is the fact that S. Matthew, S. Luke, S. John, and Acts are all about the same length.

But (3) it is not hard to shew that the several items of this section are all such as he might have been disposed to be willing to omit. I append a list of them, adding in each case a note of possible reasons for its omission by S. Luke :

Mk. vi. 45–56 (The walking on the sea, the disciples' lack of discernment, and the landing at Gennesaret).	(1) S. Luke has just before (viii. 22–25) described a storm at sea. (2) The incident might conceivably be misunderstood and supposed to involve a Docetic view of Our Lord's Person. (3) S. Luke does not insist much on the frailties of the Twelve.
Mk. vii. 1–23 (Jewish Law and Tradition).	(1) S. Luke does not think that this would particularly interest his readers. (2) He is accustomed to spare the Pharisees rather more than the other Evangelists. (3) Dr. Abbott makes (*Encycl. Bibl.*, ii, 1774) the ingenious but oversophisticated suggestion that the abrogation of the Levitical "Law of meats" may have seemed to him to point to a later period, such as that in Acts x. 9–16.
Mk. vii. 24–30 (The healing of the Syro-Phœnician woman's daughter).	At first sight this seems to be a section which S. Luke would record with peculiar pleasure. But it is to be noticed that the boon is granted only in response to great pressure. It is an exceptional favour, and the Gentiles are referred to as "dogs."

Mk. vii. 31–37 (The healing of the deaf man with an impediment in his speech).	(1) The miracle is described as having been wrought at the expense of some painful emotion on the part of Our Lord, and possibly (2) the method employed approximates too closely, in S. Luke's opinion, to those in use among Oriental professional healers.
Mk. viii. 1–10 (The feeding of the four thousand).	S. Luke has already (ix. 12–17) described the similar incident of the five thousand.
Mk. viii. 11, 12 (A sign from Heaven).	*This is the sole exception to the statement that the whole section Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26 is absent from Lk. This passage does appear in Lk. xi. 16 and 29. But the corresponding passage in Mt. is a "doublet," i.e. it appears twice, at xvi. 1–4 and xii. 38, 39. The first time Mt. has apparently drawn it from his Markan material, and the second time from his other main source, Q. And it is from this latter source that Lk. here appears to take it. Its presence in Lk. does not, therefore, invalidate the general argument about Lk.'s "Great Omission."*
Mk. viii. 13–21 (The leaven of the Pharisees).	(1) This section depends for part of its significance upon the already omitted section of the Four Thousand. (2) It is of mainly Jewish interest, and (3) it exhibits the disciples as "without understanding."
Mk. viii. 22–26 (The healing of a blind man at Bethsaida).	(1) The miracle is wrought gradually, and so seemed hardly worthy of the Master. (2) The means employed are open to the same possible objection as those mentioned above on Mk. vii. 31–37.

There is, therefore, no compelling reason why we should assume the existence, and the use by Mt. and Lk. or by Lk. of more than one edition of Mk. And on general grounds there are reasons why we should not. For the theory, as Professor Burkitt

has shewn,[1] presupposes more interest in the details of the Galilean Ministry than was really felt at first. The most interesting things to the first generation were the Passion and Resurrection, the argument from Old Testament Prophecy, and the Teaching of the Lord.

Moreover, the theory also presupposes more interest in S. Mark's Gospel than was really likely to be taken. That Gospel has come into its own with the rise of historical criticism. But for centuries it was neglected, and at one period it was very nearly lost. There was a time when the line of communication between S. Mark's autograph and ourselves was narrowed down to one single copy, and of that copy the concluding page was torn off.[2]

On the whole it appears that we may conclude without much hesitation that if *Ur-Markus* means a document differing at all considerably from our S. Mark, then there was no *Ur-Markus*. Dr. Swete testifies that he "has risen from his study of the Gospel with a strong sense of the unity of the work, and can echo the *requiescat Ur-Markus* which ends a recent discussion."[3] This verdict is not quite unqualified. The writer adds that "he is not prepared to express an opinion as to the nature and extent of the editorial revision which S. Mark's original has undergone—a point which he desires to reserve for further investigation." So Dr. Sanday rejects the idea of an *Ur-Markus*, and believes that the phenomena of Mt., Lk., are due to "a recension of the text of Mk. different from that from which all the extant MSS. of the Gospel are descended."[4] Sir John Hawkins, summing up a long discussion,[5] finds only nine details which support the two-edition theory of S. Mark. Dr. Stanton finds a greater number and those more important. But the question really belongs to the study of S. Mark's Gospel in itself. I have only touched upon it in so far as it is involved in a brief examination of the Lukan sources.

[1] *Two Lectures*, pp. 48 f.

[2] "The later Gospels, no doubt, reflected the wants and tastes of their first public, or they would never have been published at all, and the mutilated conclusion of St. Mark tells us of a period—shall we say the first quarter of the second century?—when the only copy of that Gospel which was destined to survive was lying neglected and forgotten in the tiny library of some early Christian, perhaps at Rome, perhaps at Alexandria" (Burkitt, *op. cit.*, p. 34).

[3] *St. Mark*, p. lviii n.

[4] *Oxford Studies*, p. 21.

[5] *Horae Synopticae*, 2nd ed., pp. 115–153.

It remains only to sum up very shortly the degree to which S. Luke follows his Markan authority. His first two chapters are quite independent. iii. 1–iv. 30 cover the period of Mk. i. 1–13, but in the main come from other sources. At iv. 31 he begins to follow S. Mark (Mk. i. 21) and does so with considerable fidelity as far as vi. 20. Here begins what is sometimes called his "Lesser Interpolation," i.e. vi. 20–viii. 3, the Sermon, the Centurion's Servant, the Widow of Nain, the message of the Baptist and its sequel, the woman who was a sinner, the ministering women. All this is either from the source that he shares with S. Matthew or from sources of his own. At viii. 4 the Markan narrative is resumed (Mk. iv. 1). This continues until ix. 50. At ix. 51 begins the "Great Interpolation," which goes on till xviii. 14. At xviii. 15 he turns again to Mk. x. 13, and from that point to the end he follows the Markan outline, though he makes to it a number of important additions.

CHAPTER X

THE SOURCES OF THE GOSPEL (2)

2. S. Luke's Second Source is that which he has in common with S. Matthew. The non-Markan, or practically non-Markan material,[1] which he has in common with S. Matthew, amounts to about one-sixth of his Gospel, and consists of Sayings of the Lord. This much at least of his Gospel is now usually assigned to a source described as Q, that being the initial letter of *Quelle*, the German word for "source." The advantage of such a symbol is that it does not beg any question as to the exact nature of the contents of the source. It may be taken as certain that such a source, no doubt originally Aramaic, then Greek—most probably at first oral, then written [2]—was in existence, and was used, in the same or in somewhat different forms, by the two later Evangelists. Characteristic specimens of its contents are such passages as the following: (1) That part of the Sermon on the Mount which is common to Mt. (v., vi., vii.) and Lk. (vi. 20–49) [3]; (2) the passage beginning, "Go, and tell John what things ye saw and heard" (Lk. vii. 22); (3) "All things have been delivered to me of my Father" (Lk. x. 22).

Harnack, whose reconstruction of Q may be regarded as a minimum, describes it as follows:

"Q is a compilation of discourses and sayings of Our Lord, the arrangement of which has no reference to the Passion, with an horizon that is as good as absolutely bounded by Galilee,

[1] It is sometimes thought that S. Mark shews knowledge of this source; e.g. the accounts of the preaching of John and the Temptation, and the Beelzebub passage in Mk. coincide to some extent with matter that Mt. and Lk. appear to have drawn from Q. But in any case S. Mark's use of Q can only have been very slight, and the question need not be discussed here.

[2] The stages were perhaps three—oral Aramaic, written Aramaic, written Greek.

[3] E.g. the first four beatitudes, the law of love, the mote and the beam, and the final parable of the two builders.

without any clearly discernible bias, whether apologetic, didactic, ecclesiastical, national, or anti-national. So far as any purpose at all—beyond use of imparting catechetical instruction—can be discerned in the compilation, it consisted perhaps in an endeavour to give, with a certain degree of completeness, a representation of the main features of Our Lord's relationship with His environment." Elsewhere he says: "One receives the impression that a personal disciple of Our Lord has written down all the teaching of Jesus which seemed to him most important for the life of discipleship." And again: "The compilation in Q was intended solely for the Christian community, and was addressed to those who did not require the assurance that their Teacher was also the Son of God." [1] Canon Streeter has further shewn that three points with which Q appears to have been specifically concerned were all points which would be particularly important to Palestinian Christians of the first generation. They were: (1) Our Lord's relation to the great Prophet of Palestine, John Baptist; (2) His relation to the Scribes and Pharisees; and (3) the answer to the question, "Why, if He was Messiah, did He come in such unexpected and questionable form?" [2]

So far there is among critics a fair measure of agreement. There is also agreement that, as well as sayings, Q must have contained a certain amount of matter in the form of narrative. Thus, for example, the full story of Our Lord's Temptations is non-Markan and is common to Mt. and Lk. It is therefore from Q. So is the healing of the centurion's servant (Mt. viii. 5–13, Lk. vii. 2–10, i.e. in both cases immediately following the Sermon on the Mount). Some critics proceed to argue from this that Q must also have contained an account of the Passion, and was in fact a Gospel. Thus Prof. Burkitt (*Journ. Theol. Stud.*, April 1907, p. 454), Professor Bacon and others find it inexplicable that any compilation of Christian material should begin "as a story" and end "as a homily." [3] But there is very little positive ground for thinking that Q included a Passion narrative. Moreover, the Q portions of Mt. and Lk. have the appearance of coming from a

[1] *Sayings of Jesus*, p. 171; *Date of Acts and Synoptic Gospels*, p. 138; *Sayings* p. 235.

[2] *Oxford Studies*, p. 212 f.

[3] Bacon, quoted by J. V. Bartlet in *Oxford Studies*, p. 361.

collection of sayings and not from a Gospel.[1] And it is arguable that the narratives which the source did contain were not really narratives in the strict sense at all. Thus, the story of the Temptation was perhaps regarded by the disciples as a Saying, a Self-revelation, that had come from the Master's lips, rather than as one of the events of His life; the account of the healing of the centurion's servant is said to be required to lead up to and explain the Saying, "Verily, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel"; the accounts of the appearance of S. John Baptist and of his message from the prison are necessary settings for the Sayings which it was desired to record.

It is clear, then, from what has been said that there is great divergence of opinion about the limits of Q. And it is even clearer that the attempt actually to reconstruct Q is an extremely difficult if not altogether impossible task. Professor Burkitt thinks that it can never be reconstructed, and that the attempt to do so is "futile."[2] He argues that if we had not possessed S. Mark's Gospel, and only knew or supposed that it had been used by S. Matthew and S. Luke, our attempts to reconstruct S. Mark would have been very far from correct.[3] In the same way it is impossible to reproduce Q correctly. This is quite true, and most, if not all, of those who have published their conception of Q have done so in a qualified and guarded way. Sir John Hawkins, for example, desires only to ascertain "what inferences as to the nature and contents of Q we can draw from the above eighty-four passages which are more or less likely to have been quoted from it."[4] Dr. Stanton feels "considerable confidence" in giving "a list of the passages from our first and third Gospels which there is most reason to think were contained in their common non-Markan source."[5] But, he adds, "there is some ground for going further." And few of the sixteen scholars whose reconstructions of Q are summarized in Dr. Moffatt's *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (p. 197 f.), would assert more

[1] See e.g. Stanton, *Gospels*, etc., ii. p. 105 and n. 2; Hawkins in *Oxford Studies*, p. 103.

[2] *Gospel History*, p. 17; cp. pp. 123, 131.

[3] For proof of this see the same writer in *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, April 1907, pp. 456–457; cp. Allen in *Oxford Studies*, p. 282.

[4] *Oxford Studies*, p. 118.

[5] *Gospels*, etc., ii. p. 104.

than that their reconstruction is a minimum. It is obviously difficult to decide how much of the non-Markan matter peculiar to Mt. or Lk. came originally from Q, and was for some reason not used by the other Evangelist.[1] And there is, of course, the further possibility that there were some sections of Q which have not been used by either of them. Canon Streeter describes as "highly speculative" his own attempt to "ascertain whether any passages peculiar to Matthew or Luke can be referred to Q."[2] He himself believes that much of the peculiar matter in S. Luke's "Great Interpolation" (ix. 51–xviii. 14) is from this source. Archdeacon Allen in the same volume maintains the quite different theory that Q was really a Matthæan source, and that the greater part of the non-Markan teaching in the whole of S. Matthew's Gospel came from it. This "when put together, presents us with a homogeneous, consistent, and intelligible work (no doubt only fragmentary)" (p. 242). The fact that Lk. also has many of these sayings is due to his use of another source (p. 281, 282).[3] Finally, Dr. Stanton and Dr. Bartlet are of opinion—an opinion in which Canon Streeter partially agrees—that S. Luke's version of Q was a considerably expanded form of the Q which was known to S. Matthew.[4] Dr. Bartlet even goes so far as to doubt that Q was ever written down till it was reduced to writing as part of S. Luke's Gospel. S. Luke's source is "the form assumed in the memory and teaching of some oral evangelist of the first generation." But this doubt is shared by very few scholars.[5]

So the case stands. It is, and will continue to be, a much-debated and probably insoluble question. The important problems from the point of view of S. Luke's Gospel are mainly two:

[1] E.g. Dr. Stanton points out that "if Lk. xii. 35–38 ('Let your loins be girded,' etc.) was contained in it, our first Evangelist might have passed it over on the ground that in the parable of the Ten Virgins, which he proposed to give, the same idea is more fully worked out" (*op. cit.*, ii, p. 227).

[2] *Oxford Studies*, p. 184. He suggests (p. 185) that "the passages which we can *identify as Q* by the fact that *both* Matthew and Luke reproduce them *may* possibly only represent about two-thirds of the original total matter in Q."

[3] More than this, Mr. Allen declines to assign to Q such sections as the Centurion's servant, the Preaching of John, and the Temptation (and Baptism) of Our Lord, about which other scholars speak with confidence. *Op. cit.*, p. 273.

[4] See *Gospels*, etc., ii, p. 239 f., and *Oxford Studies*, Essay XI.

[5] E.g. the careful argument of Sir John Hawkins in *Horae Synopticae*, pp. 54 f., 66, 107 f., makes it difficult to deny that Q was a written document. See also Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 44, "from a document used by both, or from two closely allied documents."

(*a*) Did Q contain a Passion, and, if so, do the peculiarities of the Lukan Passion story come from it? (*b*) How many parables are to be assigned to Q? On (*a*) the balance of opinion is against the theory, and it is generally suggested that its Palestinian readers would be perfectly acquainted with the fact that Jesus had died and risen, and that their desire at that early stage would be only for an account of what might otherwise be forgotten, namely, the teaching. It has been further suggested that Q was actually written down before the Crucifixion took place, but this can more profitably be discussed later. The other question (*b*) appears to me to be insoluble. There is little doubt that Q contained the Leaven, the Mustard-seed, the Children in the Market-place, and the parabolic conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount, but it seems to me impossible to determine how much of S. Luke's Great Interpolation came from this source, or whether we may assign to it such a passage as Mt. xi. 28–30 ("Come unto me," etc.) or the Great Assize (Mt. xxv. 31–46).[1]

The authorship of Q depends on the view taken of the famous sentence of Papias. He relates (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39) that John the Elder said, "Matthew composed the oracles (τὰ λόγια) in the Hebrew[2] language, and each man interpreted them as he was able." Very few critics now believe that this can refer to the Gospel of S. Matthew, which in the first place appears to be a document originally Greek, which further reflects too much the standpoint of the second generation to be assigned to the first, and finally is too dependent on S. Mark to be the work of an Apostle. One or two critics suppose it to be the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. Prof. Burkitt and some others believe it to have been a collection of *Testimonia* or Messianic proof-texts from the Old Testament. But the most probable view is that which identifies the Logia with Q. This would explain the connexion of the first Gospel, which is *par excellence* the Gospel of the Teaching of Jesus and makes large use of Q, with the name of S. Matthew. He was a comparatively obscure member of the Apostolic band,

[1] There is much force in Mr. Allen's remark (*Oxford Studies*, p. 238): "Now here is a strange thing, that in a document professing to be a collection of Christ's sayings there should be only four parables. The inference is obvious. Harnack's reconstructed source is at best incomplete."

[2] "Hebrew," i.e. probably Aramaic, but Biblical Hebrew is not impossible.

and it is difficult to see why his name should become attached to a Gospel without some such reason as this. At any rate, "had Matthew written, it would have been a book like this." [1]

Q is in any case a very ancient source, considerably older than S. Mark. "Nothing prevents it from being assigned to the year 50, or even earlier." [2] Canon Streeter speaks of "quite the early years," and remarks that "Q is perfectly intelligible as a document written *to supplement* the living tradition of a generation which had known Christ. Within a dozen years after the event something of the kind would be needed. It is not intelligible as a document thirty or forty years later, when the events which Q presupposes as matter of common knowledge were a generation old." [3] Some have gone even further, and have concluded that it, or at least its original Aramaic form, was written down before the Crucifixion, perhaps actually at the time of speaking. What are we to say of this? Q is certainly of early, Palestinian origin. There is evidence that the art of writing shorthand was practised at this time,[4] and of all the Apostles S. Matthew is perhaps most likely to have been acquainted with the system. There is, however, more than one way of explaining the fact (if it be a fact) that Q contained no mention of the Crucifixion.

(*a*) It is said that it dates from a time when the story of the Passion and Resurrection was well known, and the demand, perhaps caused or assisted by eschatological expectations, was for an account of the Teaching. (*b*) It is said that the Crucifixion had not yet taken place. So Sir W. M. Ramsay: "There is only one possibility. The lost Common Source of Luke and Matthew" (which, in the opinion of the writer quoted, was longer than the Q of, e.g., Harnack, and contained more narrative) ". . . was written while Christ was still living. It gives us the view which one of His disciples entertained of Him and His teaching during His lifetime, and may be regarded as authoritative for the view

[1] Streeter in *Oxford Studies*, p. 216.

[2] Harnack, *Date*, etc., p. 125 n.

[3] Streeter in *op. cit.*, pp. 212, 215. The hope is entertained in some quarters that a copy of Q may yet be discovered. But it is exceedingly unlikely. "In no soil outside Egypt could a papyrus copy of Q have lain hid and yet safe from inevitable decay; and we have no reason to imagine that Q was read in Egypt before it received its honourable burial in our Gospels" (Dr. J. H. Moulton in *Expositor*, July 1911, p. 17).

[4] See Kenyon, *Palæography*, p. 33; *Hibbert Journal*, April 1912, p. 723.

of the disciples generally. This extremely early date was what gave the lost source the high value that it had in the estimation of Matthew and Luke, and yet justified the freedom with which they handled it. . . . On the one hand it was a document practically contemporaneous with the facts, and it registered the impression made on eye-witnesses by the words and acts of Christ. On the other hand, it was written before those words and acts had begun to be properly understood by even the most intelligent eye-witnesses." References follow to Jn. ii. 22; Mt. xvi. 21 f.; Lk. ix. 44 f., xviii. 31–34 (*The Oldest Written Gospel*, in *Luke the Physician*, etc., p. 89).[1] (*c*) Archdeacon Allen believes that Ramsay is right in thinking it improbable that such a minimized version of Q as is postulated by, e.g., Harnack should have been in circulation during the generation after the Crucifixion, but instead of concluding that it was therefore written before that date, he asks "whether such a document as Harnack gives us ever existed at all . . . the source must have contained much more than is given in Harnack's reconstruction." [2]

This reminds us once more of the precariousness of all attempts to define the exact limits of Q. But, bearing in mind that the common, non-Markan element in S. Matthew and S. Luke must clearly be derived from some source, that the literary nature of their agreements points to the fact that it was a written source, and that the nature of the subject-matter concerned indicates an early date and a Palestinian origin, we may conclude with the utmost confidence that the record of Our Lord's Teaching which is embedded in the two later Gospels is a very primitive and very authentic record. In it we get as near as we shall ever get to the *ipsissima verba* of Our Lord Himself. The further fact that we are assured on very ancient authority that the Apostle Matthew made a collection of Logia enables us to make a shrewd guess as to the actual authorship. The suggestion that Q was a real Gospel and contained a Passion appears improbable. The

[1] Cp. Salmon, *The Human Element in the Gospels*, p. 274. "We have in them [the Gospels] contemporaneous history, that is to say, we have in them the stories told of Jesus immediately after His death, and which had been circulated, and, as I am disposed to believe, put in writing while He was yet alive." See also Flinders Petrie, *The Growth of the Gospels*, p. 5, though there the theory is bound up with others that are difficult to accept.

[2] *Oxford Studies*, p. 239.

inference that some or much of the peculiar matter of S. Luke and S. Matthew came from it is more likely, but extremely difficult to prove.

It remains only to indicate the use which appears to have been made of Q by the first and third Evangelists. Q probably consisted of undated and perhaps unconnected fragments. It may be that each began, like some of the recently discovered *Oxyrhynchus Sayings*, and like some of the liturgical Gospels in the Book of Common Prayer,[1] with " Jesus said." If this was so, we can partly see how our Evangelists dealt with their material. We know that S. Matthew is accustomed to combine his matter into blocks for convenience of teaching. Thus, to take only one example, in Mt. the Sermon on the Mount occupies three chapters (v., vi., vii.), while in Lk. the corresponding Sermon " on the level place " comprises part only of one chapter (vi.), and the remainder of the Lukan parallels to the Matthæan sermon are found in as many as seven different chapters of the Gospel. The same applies to Mt.'s other collections. In fact, three-quarters of Q, as it is recovered by Sir John Hawkins, is differently placed in Mt. and Lk.[2] It is *a priori* easier to believe that one Evangelist has combined originally separated material than that another has broken up what lay before him as a compact whole. Moreover, the first Gospel shews other traces of editorial arrangement,[3] which are not present in Lk., and most scholars believe that S. Luke has adhered more closely to the original order,[4] although they admit that he has recast the language with some freedom. This belief is largely based on observation of the ways in which the two Evangelists have used their known Markan source.

3. The Great Interpolation.

It is generally agreed that much of the Great Interpolation (Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14) came from a third source. Some of it is

[1] In the Gospels for the Ninth and Twentieth Sundays after Trinity the words " Jesus said " are added for the sake of clearness.

[2] *Oxford Studies*, p. 120.

[3] E.g. the recurrent formula with which the Evangelist closes his five " Teaching collections " (vii. 28, xi. 1, xiii. 53, xix. 1, xxvi. 1).

[4] E.g. Stanton, *Gospels*, etc., ii, pp. 74–76; Burkitt, *Gospel History*, p. 130; Armitage Robinson, *Study of the Gospels*, pp. 87, 95; Streeter, *Oxford Studies*, p. 141 f; von Soden, *Hist. of Early Christian Literature*, p. 129. See, on the other side, Harnack, *Sayings*, p. 174 f.

from Q, as is proved by the fact that it is paralleled in S. Matthew. This applies especially to the earlier part,[1] e.g. the charge to the disciples in x. 2–12, the Lord's Prayer (xi. 2–4), and the consequent exhortations to fervency in prayer (xi. 9–13). But there are many other passages. The total amounts to about 170 verses. We are then faced by the question, raised in the previous division of this chapter, whether any of the purely Lukan matter in this section can also be assigned to Q, and, if so, how much of it. Canon Streeter's argument in Essay VI of *Oxford Studies* is very interesting, but very speculative. It may be, as he tentatively suggests, that the incident of Martha and Mary (x. 38–42) was in Q, and was omitted by S. Matthew because he feared the possible drawing of such an antinomian conclusion as that against which S. James protests in his Epistle. It may be that S. Matthew would not understand "The Kingdom of God is within you" (Lk. xvii. 21), and therefore omitted it. It may be that some of the other motives which are suggested in particular cases were really operative.[2] But it is clearly impossible to feel certain. The argument is necessarily heterogeneous, and not conclusive.

The utmost that can be said is that some of the Great Interpolation was certainly drawn from Q, and that some further part of it is very likely to have come from the same source.

We pass, therefore, to the general consideration of the section as a whole. We are prepared by the Evangelist's own reference to "many" in i. 1, to suppose that he was acquainted with more than two sources. As to the nature of the third source which was used by him in this section, two theories are of importance.

(1) A travel-document, containing a number of parables, may have been drawn up by him at some earlier date, i.e. perhaps before he had begun to make use of S. Mark's Gospel for the general purpose of his whole book.[3] But this does not carry us very far. S. Luke was not an eye-witness of any of the events, and there must be some ulterior source.

(2) It is suggested that his informant must have been one of

[1] "ix. 51–xii. 59, of which nearly four-fifths, as also occurring in Matthew, is *verifiably* Q, as is the case also with all but a few verses of xiii. 18–35" (Streeter, *Oxford Studies*, p. 189).

[2] Cp. the reference to Lk. xii. 35–38, on p. 139, above.

[3] So Sir John Hawkins in *Oxford Studies*, pp. 53–56.

the early Palestinian disciples, perhaps one of the Seventy, whose mission is described by him alone. A name that readily occurs to the imagination is that of Philip, the father of the four prophetic daughters, by whom S. Luke (Acts xxi. 8, "we") was entertained at Cæsarea. This visit lasted some time (xxi. 10), and very shortly afterwards S. Paul was again at Cæsarea for two years (xxiv. 27). It is not certain that S. Luke was there too during the whole of that period, but it is certain that at the end of it S. Paul and he left Cæsarea together (xxvii. 1). The use of such a source would explain a number of the features in the section, i.e. the feminine interest (x. 38–42, xi. 27, xiii. 10 f., xv. 8 f., xviii. 1 f., xxiii. 27 f.), the Samaritan interest (ix. 52, x. 33, xvii. 11, 16; cp. Acts viii. 5 f.), and perhaps, though this is more doubtful, the connexion observable between the third and fourth Gospels.[1]

This argument may easily be extended to cover the earlier and later portions of S. Luke's Gospel as well as this section. The Nativity, the Genealogy, the Preaching of John, the Sermon at Nazareth, the incident at Nain, and the Lukan story of the Passion are indebted to a Palestinian authority, which it is not unreasonable to connect with Philip. But it will be seen presently that in the case of the Nativity there are alternative suggestions, which are perhaps more conjectural but certainly more attractive.

4. A Fourth Source appears to be indicated in **S. Luke's account of the Passion.** There he does not abandon S. Mark, but uses him with freedom, and makes a number of additions.

Various explanations have been suggested for this:

(*a*) S. Luke had access to some written record of the Passion. A form of this theory is the suggestion, already noted, that Q contained a Passion narrative. If by Q is meant a document used in the same form by Mt. and Lk., it seems to me impossible. S. Matthew would never have omitted the many important and edifying things that Q on this theory contained. If by Q in this connexion is meant an expanded version of Q which had reached

[1] See especially Bartlet, *Oxford Studies*, p. 352, and in general compare Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, pp. 155 f., 164, and App. iv. See also above, pp. 13, 31. It is also worth noting that Acts xxi. 18 ("with us") shews that S. Luke came into contact with James, the Lord's brother.

S. Luke, it still seems improbable, in view of what we can otherwise infer as to the nature of Q, that it was expanded by the addition of so much narrative. If all reference to Q be excluded, the theory of a Passion document of some kind remains possible, though there is practically no proof of its existence.

(*b*) Sir John Hawkins dismisses the above theory on the ground that close investigation shows that "Luke's additions are (unlike Matthew's) so mixed up with the *Grundschrift*, and they have caused alterations and modifications of such kinds, as to suggest a long and gradual conflation in the mind, rather than a simple conflation by the pen." [1] He proceeds to argue (i) that S. Luke was a fellow-worker with S. Paul, and therefore, no doubt, a preacher, or at least a catechist. (ii) The matter of S. Paul's "Gospel" was mainly the Death and Resurrection of the Lord. (iii) The section of S. Luke's Gospel with which we are concerned is the record of the Passion, and, moreover, it begins with the Last Supper, which is the only Gospel incident described in detail by S. Paul. (iv) The Lukan additions are such as would be useful to a preacher, and have constantly been employed by preachers in all ages.[2]

All this is true, but the difficulty remains that, unlike the parables of the Great Interpolation, the Lukan additions here are not particularly "Pauline." [3]

(*c*) It is to be observed that this section contains special information about Herod. The Trial before Herod (xxiii. 7–12), with what is generally but perhaps mistakenly called the Mocking before Herod,[4] and the reconciliation of Herod and Pilate, are

[1] *Oxford Studies*, p. 90.

[2] "Let any preacher of experience, after recalling the two lists of additions made by the First and Third Evangelists respectively, ask himself how often he has made use of the Matthæan additions in comparison with those made by S. Luke" (*op. cit.*, p. 93).

[3] Dr. Moulton (*Expositor*, July 1911) brought forward some interesting arguments to support the view that (1) Paul's hatred of Jesus was due to his application to Him of the "false prophet" passage in Deut. xiii. 1–5; (2) that he had busied himself in Jerusalem before the Crucifixion in collecting evidence against Him; (3) that some of the Pauline echoes of Gospel language were due not to tradition but to actual recollection; (4) that his insistence on the Passion was due to the fact that he had witnessed it himself; and (5) that the face that he saw on his road to Damascus was the face that he had seen before on the Cross. The whole article, though not very convincing, is most instructive, and helps us to realize how great was the loss to the cause of Christian scholarship when Dr. Moulton lost his life "by perils on the sea" early in 1917. For (3) see above, p. 26 n.

[4] See below, p. 199 f.

peculiar to this Gospel. Elsewhere, too, S. Luke is well informed about Herod and his court. See, for example, iii. 1, ix. 7 (where the report that John Baptist had risen again is only a common rumour, and not assigned, as in Mk. vi. 16, Mt. xiv. 2, to the Tetrarch himself),[1] xiii. 31, 32 ("Herod seeketh to kill thee . . . go, tell that fox"), Acts xii. 21 f.[2] Compare also the reference to Archelaus and a journey that he took to Rome, which is worked into the Lukan parable of the Pounds (xix. 11 f.). Now, there are mentioned in the Lukan writings two persons who probably possessed, and may well have imparted to the Evangelist, information of this kind. One is Manaen, who in Acts xiii. 1 is described as the foster-brother of Herod. The other is Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, who is twice mentioned in the Gospel (viii. 3, xxiv. 10, i.e. once in the present connexion), and nowhere else. It seems not improbable that Joanna was a source of the Evangelist's Herodian sections, and perhaps of much else as well. There is also, as before, the probability that S. Luke gathered a certain amount of Palestine and Jerusalem information at Cæsarea, and from S. James.

5. The fifth and only remaining Lukan source is that used by him for his account of the Nativity and Childhood of Our Lord. This must be considered separately.

Meantime let us for a moment survey results. How far have we penetrated behind our existing documents, and what do we know of S. Luke as an historian?

The conclusion to which we must come is that S. Luke's Gospel, as has often been pointed out, is a new work. It is, as Renan said, "the most beautiful book in the world," but with this we are not concerned for the moment. The point is that, whereas the first Evangelist takes S. Mark's Gospel and is content to prefix to it an account of the Nativity, and to insert in it at various places (*a*) collections of Our Lord's teaching and parables, (*b*) various fulfilments of Old Testament prophecy, and (*c*) a few

[1] It has been conjectured that Herod was a Sadducee. In any case their tenets were certainly known, and perhaps congenial, to him.

[2] On Acts xii. 1–19: Sir W. M. Ramsay (*The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament*, p. 220) holds that "there is nothing improbable in the supposition that some person influential in the entourage of Herod Agrippa I had skilfully engineered the escape of Peter."

incidents, connected in some cases with S. Peter, while otherwise he follows the Markan outline, S. Luke, on the other hand, uses his materials much more freely, and constructs a new book. It is clear, I think, that he was accustomed to appeal, as he says in his Preface, to the best authorities, and, wherever possible, to eye-witnesses. We cannot determine the exact degree of credibility which must be assigned to his authorities, other than S. Mark and Q. But it does not seem necessary to think of Philip and his daughters or of "Christians of Jerusalem or Judæa who had wandered from Palestine" as "ecstatics, altogether wanting in sober-mindedness and credibility," and to draw from that the conclusion that the authenticity of his special traditions is "almost entirely dubious and . . . must indeed be described for the most part as legendary."[1] S. Paul had visions, and said, "I thank God, I speak with tongues more than you all," but he was also a practical, sane person. If in S. Luke, as in the other Gospels, there are occasional inconsistencies and indications of the use of sources with different points of view, they only shew the faithfulness with which S. Luke and the other Evangelists used such materials as they had. Recall once again the claim that S. Luke makes (I paraphrase and modernize his language): "The attempt has been made in many quarters to draw up a narrative of those facts (*πραγμάτων*), the occurrence and results of which have led to the existence of our society, namely, the Church, whose belief is founded on the traditions of persons who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word. I have determined to take a further step. I have once more traced the course of the whole series of events with accurate research, and I now present you, most excellent Theophilus, with an ordered history, that you may by means of this fuller treatment be reassured as to the accuracy of those points on which you have already received summary information."

[1] So Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, pp. 152, 153.

CHAPTER XI

THE NATIVITY (1)

It is time now to turn to the difficult question which was raised at the end of the eighth chapter. The widow of Nain and the Publican and Zacchæus are good types of the kind of person for whom, in S. Luke's opinion, the Christian religion is intended. They are good texts for Pauline sermons. They are mentioned in S. Luke only. Is there any ground for supposing that he, or some like-minded person, invented them as suitable illustrations of his meaning? The sections in question are all interesting and important, but much the most important and much the most interesting of them is the Nativity. A learned friend of the writer said of the lectures on which this book is founded: "Many of your hearers will want to know about the first two chapters, and some of them will not be content to be put off in the usual way." This is a challenge which must be taken up.

(1) The first point of interest is the style in which the narrative is written. There is between the first four verses of chapter i. and the remainder of the first two chapters one of the most startling contrasts to be found in any book. The Preface is written in literary Greek, and is like the Preface to the History of Polybius or some other Greek historian. The rest is in the archaic Hebraistic style of Genesis. It is dangerous nowadays to talk of Semitisms, because since the recent discovery of tens of thousands of papyrus writings in Egypt, comprising non-literary documents, letters, wills, proclamations, and business communications of all kinds, it is known that the whole Mediterranean world spoke the kind of Greek which was formerly called New Testament Greek, and the number of genuine Semitisms which can be found in the New Testament has been diminished to an extraordinary extent. Whereas in 1895 Prof. Kennedy estimated that there were

550 "Biblical" words in the vocabulary of the New Testament, Prof. Deissmann now estimates that there are 50.[1] It is probable that Deissmann, like most pioneers, has rather exaggerated his case. Neither the language nor the personality of S. Paul are quite so non-literary as he alleges.[2] But even he allows that there are in the New Testament fifty Hebraic words, and also that there are Hebraisms of phrase. Of these Hebraic turns of phrase a large number are found in these two chapters. A glance at the language of Lk. i. 5–7 will illustrate the statement. Hebraic expressions are in italics.

"*It came to pass* in the *days* of Herod the king of Judæa that there was a certain priest by name Zacharias of the course of Abijah, and his wife was of the *daughters of* Aaron, and her name (was) Elizabeth. And they were both *righteous before* God, *walking* in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless. And they had no child, because Elizabeth was barren, and both were *advanced in their days*."

There are two possible explanations of the phenomena. Dr. Moulton has said: "In Luke, the only New Testament writer, except the author of Hebrews, to show any conscious attention to Greek ideas of style, we find (1) rough Greek translations from Aramaic left mainly as they reached him, perhaps because their very roughness seemed too characteristic to be refined away; and (2) a very limited imitation of the LXX. idiom, as specially appropriate while the story moves in the Jewish world."[3] And it is certain either that S. Luke was here depending on an Aramaic

[1] *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 71 f. Cp. "The Holy Ghost spoke absolutely in the language of the people, as we might surely have expected He would" (Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Prolegomena, p. 5.

[2] E.g. "St. Paul generally dictated his letters, no doubt because writing was not an easy thing to his workman's hand . . . his *large* handwriting, over which he himself makes merry" (*op. cit.*, p. 153 n. 2).

[3] *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, i, p. 18. Dr. Moulton continues: "The conscious adaptation of his own style to that of sacred writings long current among his readers reminds us of the rule which restricted our nineteenth-century Biblical Revisers to the English of the Elizabethan age." Cp. also the following passage from the same authority in *Cambridge Biblical Essays* (p. 480): "Epic poetry, even down to Nonnus, must endeavour to follow the nondescript dialect into which Ionic rhapsodists had transformed the Achaian of Homer. Choral odes in tragedy and comedy must preserve the broad *ā* which witnesses to the origin of drama in some region outside the area of the Ionic-Attic. We can, therefore, understand the instinct that would lead the educated Greek Evangelist to suit his style under certain conditions to the book which held the same relation to his Gospel as the *Iliad* held to subsequent experiments in Epic verse."

(or possibly Hebrew) source, or else that he wrote in an archaic style himself on purpose, in order to present the traditional story in suitable dress. It is an attractive theory that he was himself responsible, and though this would be a daring assumption in the case of any other New Testament writer, a comparison of i. 1–4 with iii.–xxiv. proves that S. Luke had more than one style at his command. He may have written i. 5–ii. 52 in Hebraic style, because it was a Palestinian story, with close affinities to certain Old Testament narratives, e.g. the birth of Samson, the story of Elijah, and the story of Hannah. The same phenomena recur in Acts. The first part of Acts, as long as the scene is Jerusalem, is in Hebraic, though not, as here, in ultra-Hebraic style. The second part of Acts, where the stage is the Hellenic world, is written in ordinary, polished Greek.

The conjecture is attractive, but far from certain. There is reason to expect that more of the characteristic Lukan diction would be traceable even in such a composition than can actually be observed. And it has often been pointed out that these chapters exhibit a local colouring which S. Luke himself nowhere contributes in his Gospel (e.g. i. 39, 65, and the use of the Hebrew form Μαριάμ for Μαρία), and come quite certainly from a primitive, Palestinian and practically pre-Christian environment.[1] They reflect so clearly the tone of the actual period that some critics pronounce the material here used to be the most ancient thing in the New Testament.[2]

For our present purpose it does not matter much whether the style here is the Evangelist's or that of his source, because in any case he must in some way be depending on Palestinian sources, just as he does in the early chapters of Acts.

(2) The census. Some years ago the census (ii. 1) was regarded as a serious difficulty. It was known that Quirinius was Governor of Syria in A.D. 6, i.e. ten years after the death of Herod the Great, and that in his time a census was conducted, not after

[1] Cp. the fact that the announcement in ii. 10 is "to the people," i.e. Israel, although, of course, Lk. ii. 32 (Isaiah xlix. 6) must not be forgotten.

[2] "These two chapters—whatever the date at which they were first committed to writing—are essentially the most archaic thing in the whole New Testament, older really in substance—whatever may be the date of their actual committal to writing—than 1 and 2 Thessalonians" (Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 166).

the Jewish method described in the Gospel, according to which each man is enrolled in his own ancestral city, but after a house-to-house method. This later census led to a riot among the Jews, which is mentioned in Acts v. 37, and in Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. i. 1, and elsewhere. Nothing was known of any "Jewish" census or of any governorship of Quirinius at the time required, i.e. 8–6 B.C.,[1] and it was not impossible to draw the conclusion that S. Luke had invented the whole story in order to account for the Nativity being at Bethlehem instead of Nazareth, even though it would not be a very good invention for the purpose.[2]

But in recent years some remarkable discoveries have changed the situation. The whole question is discussed in Sir W. M. Ramsay's *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* and more briefly by Dr. Sanday in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible* (art. "Jesus Christ"), and Dr. P. Gardner in *Encycl. Bibl.* (art. "Quirinius"). Ramsay's researches, which have been corroborated by other discoveries still later,[3] have shewn that there were periodical enrolments, certainly in Egypt, and probably in Syria, every fourteen years. This cycle brings us to about the date required. Further, it is known that Herod was anxious to persuade the Romans to conciliate the Jews in all reasonable ways (the rebellion of A.D. 6 was probably due to the innovation of conducting the census in the Roman manner); and lastly, there is some ground for thinking that Quirinius did

[1] The date 7–6 B.C. is arrived at by Mr. C. H. Turner as the result of five converging lines of inquiry (Hastings, *Dict. of the Bible*, art. "Chronology of the New Testament," i. p. 415 f.).

[2] E.g. Loisy (*Les Évangiles synoptiques*, i, p. 169): "Le moyen presque mécanique dont le narrateur s'est servi pour faire naître le Christ dans la patrie de David se fonde sur un anachronisme des plus fâcheux, le recensement de Quirinius étant postérieur d'une dizaine d'années à la mort d'Hérode le Grand." Ramsay, however, notes that "the mere commonplace historians of Rome are much more merciful to Luke's account of the census than the theological critics." He refers to Mommsen, *Res Gestae Divi Aug.*, p. 176 f. (*The Bearing of Recent Discovery*, etc., p. 229).

[3] E.g. Deissmann has published a newly discovered edict of G. Vibius Maximus, governor of Egypt, A.D. 104, which runs as follows: "The enrolment by household being at hand, it is necessary to notify all who for any cause soever are outside their homes to return to their domestic hearths, that they may also accomplish the customary dispensation of enrolment and continue stedfastly in the husbandry that belongeth to them" (*Light from the Ancient East*, p. 268; see also Kenyon and Bell, *British Museum Papyri*, iii, p. 124; and Milligan, *Selections from the Greek Papyri*, p. 73). A fourteen-year series running backwards from 104 gives A.D. 6 and 8 B.C. There is actual papyrus evidence of enrolment in the years A.D. 90, 48, and 20 in Egypt, and perhaps in Syria (Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, v. 356a; Rendel Harris in *Expositor*, March 1908, p. 217). It will be noticed that the procedure indicated in the edict given above tends to support the common belief, based on Mt. ii. 22 (not Lk.) that Bethlehem was Joseph's own original home.

hold some kind of command in Syria in 11–8 or 7 B.C. It is therefore supposed that S. Luke knew of these two commands, and alludes to the fact in the word "first" (ii. 2). Tertullian says (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 19) that Our Lord was born in the governorship of Sentius Saturninus (i.e. 9–6 B.C.). This comes evidently from some source other than S. Luke's Gospel, and it is not impossible that Tertullian, as a lawyer, had access to official lists. Mr. Turner (in the important article already referred to) came to the conclusion that S. Luke was in the main correct, but was in error as to the name of the governor. This may well be, but Sir W. M. Ramsay, on the strength of further inscriptions discovered at Antioch, argues that Quirinius and Saturninus both held commands in Syria at the same time, and that these commands were respectively military and civil.[1] The question is too complicated to be fully discussed here, and it remains difficult to understand why Mary should have accompanied Joseph, especially if it be the fact that she was at that time only "betrothed" to him.[2] But there is some real ground for supposing that S. Luke's historical and political accuracy, which has been so well tested in Acts, is not deficient here.[3]

(3) Sources. From whom does the information come? The nature of the Evangelist's authority, in a linguistic sense, has already been considered. The source, as we have seen, is Palestinian, and the connexion, already noted, of the Evangelist with Philip and his daughters is again a possible guide. Can we go

[1] *Expositor*, Nov. 1912. "We can now prove by indisputable contemporary evidence that Quirinius was governing Syria about the time of the first census" (p. 385). It is to be noted that S. Luke does not say that Quirinius was proconsul (*ἀνθύπατος*), but governor (*ἡγεμών*). Cp. *The Bearing of Recent Discovery*, etc., pp. 222–296.

[2] Sir W. M. Ramsay (*Expositor*, Nov. 1912, p. 386) adopts Colonel Mackinlay's suggestion (*The Magi: How they recognized Christ's Star*) that Joseph and Mary combined their census visit to Bethlehem with a visit to Jerusalem on the occasion of the Feast of Tabernacles.

[3] Prof. Lake (*Expositor*, Nov. 1912, p. 462 f.) has suggested an entirely new chronology for the period covered by the Gospels. Confronted by the evidence of Josephus, and what he considers to be the consequent necessity of dating the marriage of Herod and Herodias as late as A.D. 35, and accepting the general accuracy of S. Mark's account of the death of S. John Baptist, he is compelled to throw over the record in Mt., which gives the Nativity as within the lifetime of Herod the Great (*d.* 4 B.C.), and supposes that it took place in A.D. 6, the year of Quirinius' undoubted governorship and of the "Roman" census. It then becomes necessary to emend Gal. ii. 1 "fourteen years" into "four years." This is easily done at the cost of a single *iota* (= 10). Prof. Lake points out with justice that the fourteen years are "an almost blank space in the history of St. Paul." His article is tentative, and hardly does more than suggest the reopening of the question.

further? Readers of S. Luke have often noticed that he shews a special sympathy and, I think we may say, affinity with women. As far as these chapters are concerned, it is quite obvious. The tale is told from a woman's point of view. In chapter i. there are verse 7, verses 24, 25, verse 26 ("in the sixth month"); there is the whole story of the Nativity, told as it affected Mary, whereas S. Matthew's narrative is from the point of view of Joseph; there is the intimate and touching story of the Visitation in 39–44; there is the Magnificat; and the "three months" of verse 56. In chapter ii. there is verse 19 ("But Mary kept all these things, and pondered them in her heart"); there is verse 34 ("And Simeon said unto Mary his mother, . . . A sword shall go through thine own heart also"); there is verse 48 ("And his mother said unto him, Son why hast thou thus dealt with us?"); and verse 51 ("His mother kept all these sayings in her heart"). Many of these details, and especially perhaps "the peculiar method of dating the events" in i. 24, 26, 56, can hardly have come from any but one of the two women concerned. It may well be that S. Luke, as a physician, would be able, more easily than another, to acquire and use information of this particular kind, and in any case he is the author of "the Women's Gospel." [1]

There is no other definite counter-theory of the actual source. Hints and surmisings which proceed from the belief that the whole story is a legend will be considered later. Harnack, after laying down that "there can be no doubt that these stories have been freely edited by a poetic artist, namely, St. Luke," continues: "But there can be just as little doubt that St. Luke regarded them as proceeding from St. Mary; for his practice elsewhere as an historian proves that he could not by himself have invented a fiction like this. Hence we may conclude that they came to him with the authority of St. Mary, and therefore certainly from Palestine." [2] The fact that he speaks in his Preface of having

[1] For the whole argument of this section I am much indebted to Dr. Sanday, *Critical Questions*, p. 139. Dr. A. Wright has suggested (*Gospel according to S. Luke*, p. viii) that "certain other sections which are connected with the Holy Family, viz. the Genealogy, the Visit to Nazareth, and the Raising of the Widow's Son at Nain," are from the same source as chapters i. and ii.

[2] *Date of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels*, Eng. tr., p. 155. The mention of "these stories" is due to Harnack's acceptance of the belief that not only did the part relating to the birth of John Baptist come from a different source (as in the last analysis it is obvious that it must), but that it took shape among the disciples of the Baptist. He

received information from "those who *from the beginning* were eye-witnesses" can hardly be pressed, in view of Acts i. 22, x. 37, where the "beginning" is from the Baptism of John, unless indeed we suppose, with Dr. Chase, that Acts was written first.

But it need not have come from Our Lady to S. Luke direct. We know that the Evangelist did spend some time at Cæsarea (Acts xxi. 8), which was near Jerusalem, and if Mary was still living it is possible that he may have had speech of her at that time. But of course this is quite unprovable, and it is safer to conjecture that the story came to him through some intermediary. This may perhaps have been Joanna, whom he mentions among the little group of women of whom Mary was one (Lk. xxiv. 10; Acts i. 14). But even this is only a guess.

There have not been wanting suggestions that the whole idea is pagan, and that the narrative has therefore a non-Jewish source. The theory has even been hazarded that the Evangelist adopted the language in which the courtly Roman world rejoiced at the birth of Augustus! And stories of supernatural birth are quoted from Greece, Egypt, India, Babylon, and many other places.

Some orthodox Christians are distressed when they discover the existence of these quasi-parallels, but it is surely a support rather than a trial to faith to learn on the one hand that the Christian revelation is the satisfaction of what has been an almost

makes the further suggestion that S. Luke had perhaps himself been an adherent of that school, and that the wondering (iii. 15) concerning John, "whether he were the Christ" reproduces his own early experiences. It is an ingenious theory, but the evidence in its favour is practically *nil*. Even if it be granted that there were originally two sources, they arose in precisely similar environments. The tone of the *Benedictus* and of the *Magnificat* and the *Nunc Dimittis* are the same. There is indeed much to be said for the hypothesis that S. Luke had been in some kind of touch with members of that early Palestinian group. He makes certain additions to the Synoptic account of John's preaching (iii. 10–14), and he is interested (Acts xviii. 24–28, xix. 1–8) in the survival of the "Johannine" sect in later days. But there is also plenty of evidence (in Q) that the great importance of the Baptist and some definition of Our Lord's relation to him was an integral part of early Christian teaching. A detailed account of S. John's preaching, and knowledge of the musings created by his advent, do not require any very special explanation. And the references in Acts (difficult as it is to say exactly what is meant by "the things concerning Jesus" and "knowing only the Baptism of John" in xviii. 25) are quite a natural part of the general story of S. Paul. Apollos was a sort of "John Baptist" to S. Paul, and the Ephesian incident in chapter xix. was a second, rather different, illustration of the Apostolic practice of laying hands on the baptized, of which an ordinary case had been described in chapter viii. The ἐβαπτίσθησαν of *v.* 5 (as contrasted with *v.* 6, "Paul") is incidentally an illustration of the Pauline principle laid down in 1 Cor. i. 17.

universal human instinct, and on the other hand to realize, as is undoubtedly the case, that the Christian story of the Birth of the Redeemer is incomparably the purest, most beautiful, and most edifying of all known versions of a supernatural birth.

But as a matter of fact the best authorities are all agreed that the Gospel stories cannot possibly have a pagan origin. Pagan ideas were so abhorrent to the Church till long after the doctrine was thoroughly established in the Creed that the suggested importation is wholly incredible. "The idea," to use Harnack's words, "contradicts the entire earliest development of Christian tradition" (*History of Dogma*, Eng. tr., i, p. 100 n.). The story quite certainly originated in a Jewish circle. There is hardly a verse in either S. Matthew's or S. Luke's account which does not contain evidence of this. And yet it cannot have been borrowed from non-Christian Judaism. The Jews had no particular reverence for virginity. And if it be thought that Isaiah vii. 14 ("A virgin shall conceive") must have created among Jews the expectation that Messiah would be Virgin-born and that the Christian belief must then have been borrowed from that expectation, it is the fact that there was no such expectation. Isaiah's words were never regarded by the Jews as a prediction of Messiah's birth of a virgin.[1] Jews in the time of Justin Martyr regarded the Matthæan interpretation of the text as a Christian misinterpretation, and maintained that the meaning in the original was "a young woman shall conceive."

One final point in connexion with the source or sources arises from a comparison of the Lukan and Matthæan accounts. They are very different, so different that they are unquestionably independent of one another. Yet they are both records of a Supernatural Birth. And though the canonical date of both

[1] So Canon Box, *The Virgin Birth of Jesus*, p. 220. To this book I am indebted for a number of points in this and the following chapter. The "Philonian traditions," referred to by Dr. Abbott in *Encycl. Bibl.*, ii. 1778, are so vague, and Philo is so thoroughgoing an allegorist of the text of the Old Testament, that nothing can be inferred from them, and Dr. Abbott's own inference is contrary to the general trend of Jewish thought. Harnack remarks (*Date of Acts*, etc., p. 146, n. 1) that "the testimony adduced from Philo is without importance." Prof. Usener (*Encycl. Bibl.*, iii. 3351) admits that the language of Philo "does not teach Virgin birth," though, he adds, "it certainly teaches divine generation."

accounts is post-Markan, they both breathe the atmosphere of the quite early days when Christianity was still a part of Judaism. The fact of their agreement and the wideness of their divergence combine to require a considerable period behind them. The essential story which they relate is not a recent myth, but one that dates from early days.

CHAPTER XII

THE NATIVITY (2)

THE most important part of the inquiry is still to come. Is the narrative, or how far is the narrative, idealized? I will begin by offering four general considerations.

(*a*) Theology and Documents.

Matters of this sort, involving belief or disbelief in the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, are not determined, and cannot be determined, by sheer literary and historical criticism. I have heard a very distinguished scholar say that to him the documents were convincing. I cannot take that view. It does not seem to me that any document can settle a matter of this kind. My own belief in the doctrine is part of my general belief in the Incarnation, of which it seems to me to be a subordinate and not discordant part. It is not based on the documents, though it is assisted and confirmed by them, and, I will add, by S. Luke more than by S. Matthew. It is part of a larger belief. And the kind of criticism which was before described as a complete criticism is one that takes account of facts in their relation to other facts.[1]

This is at once the weak point and the strong point of the case for the belief. On the one hand the criticism can easily be made: "You apparently do not object to rationalizing a miracle or two here and there. You are willing to explain away the coin in the fish's mouth (Mt. xvii. 24–27) or to give up the walking on the sea (Mt. xiv. 28–31). But you stop short of anything that

[1] "A mind unwilling to believe, or even undesirous to believe, our weightiest evidence must ever fail to impress. It will insist on taking the evidence in bits and rejecting item by item. The man who announces his intention of waiting until a single bit of absolutely conclusive evidence turns up, is really a man *not* open to conviction, and if he be a logician he *knows* it. For modern logic has made it plain that single facts can never be 'proved,' except by their coherence in a system. But as all the facts come singly, any one who destroys them one by one is destroying the conditions under which the conviction of new truth could arise in his mind" (F. C. S. Schiller, quoted by Sir W. F. Barrett in the Preface to *On the Threshold of the Unseen*).

really matters." On the other hand the defence is obvious: "The things that matter are the things in which principle is most clearly seen."

The question then is, What, in this connexion, is the principle, and is it seen more clearly in the traditional belief than in any other? The principle is the principle of the Incarnation, and that, I take it, means (i) a genuine arrival of that which is truly divine, and (ii) a genuine assumption of that which is truly human. Moreover, (iii) this arrival of the divine and this assumption of the human are initial and creative.

Now, is this Incarnation principle more clearly exhibited in the doctrine of a Virgin Birth than in any other? For myself I have no doubt of it. For it must be remembered that purity is positive, not negative. It is far from consisting merely in the absence of violation. It is a white flame, an eager, burning, and creative thing. We should enter more fully into that which God has wished (and wishes) His Church to believe if we thought and spoke less of what is to be understood by the "virginity" of Mary than of what is to be understood by "conceived of the Holy Ghost."

Belief in the Virgin Birth is not essential, if by "essential" is meant a preliminary condition. It is not a preliminary, but a subsequent and consequent belief. I am sure that it is genuinely consequent, that is, divinely intended, divinely taught, and true. And I suspect that if it were abandoned, belief in the Incarnation would be damaged.

But this is prediction, the truth of which cannot be proved. Nor does it seem possible to deny the Christianity of some who assert that they believe the Incarnation, but are unable to express belief in the Virgin Birth. But it was, nevertheless, a true instinct which led the Catholic Church to express its own belief in the Incarnation by a clause in the Creed which speaks in one breath of the Holy Spirit and of the Virgin Mary; it seems fitting that the Birth of One Who is Very God in Very Man should originate in a divine-human mystery, earthly enough and at the same time heavenly enough to satisfy the twofold presuppositions of Redemption; and the unorthodox or quasi-orthodox Christians, with powers of devout intuition which make them impatient of

the Church's logic, owe more to the traditional doctrine than they think.

There is little space here to elaborate doctrinal points, but three reasons may be briefly given for connecting the ideas of Divine Incarnation and Virgin Birth. They correspond to the three points named just now as involved in the Incarnation principle :

(i) The first is summed up in the words of S. Ambrose, *Talis partus decet Deum.* When the Lord our God, that hath His dwelling so high, humbleth Himself to behold, and to adopt, the things that are in earth, the new thing that now begins to be, the heavenly reinforcement, the fresh accession of divinity to an else hopeless world, demands a newness in the manner of its arrival which shall correspond with the newness of the gift it brings. He is to baptize men, no longer with mere water, but with the Holy Ghost and with fire, and the Advent of the fire-bearing, Spirit-bringing Saviour is vouchsafed to Mary by the burning touch of the most Holy Paraclete.

(ii) The second point is that Our Lord is a new humanity. S. Paul calls Him " The Second Adam." And the fact that Adam is now no longer thought of as an individual, but rather as " primitive man," i.e. a collective life, lasting many generations, and perhaps spread over many parts of the surface of the earth, only increases the value of the comparison. For Christ's humanity is universal. As S. Irenæus said, *longam hominum expositionem in seipso recapitulavit.*[1] This thought has been admirably put by Dr. Du Bose :

" Who and What is Jesus Christ, in His real and essential personality ? The answer which the artless, and yet most profoundly artful, so-called nursery myth forestalls and excludes is this, He was no mere natural offspring of Joseph and Mary. Why not ? Because the product of every such natural union is an

[1] III, 19, 1 (ed. Harvey). The word occurs constantly in Irenæus, who is fond of expounding the thought of Eph. i. 10. In one place (II, 33, 2–4) he infers from Jno. viii. 56, 57 that Our Lord had reached the age of nearly fifty, and argues that, being a Master, He came " not despising or evading any condition of humanity, nor abrogating in His own person the law which He had made for the human race, but sanctifying every age . . . infans . . . parvulus . . . juvenis . . . sic et senior . . . deinde et usque ad mortem pervenit, ut sit primogenitus ex mortuis, ipse primatum tenens in omnibus, princeps vitae, prior omnium, et praecedens omnes."

individual human person. Viewing Jesus Christ in that light it is impossible to construe Him otherwise than as a human individual, exceptionally favoured by unique relations with God" (*The Gospel in the Gospels*, p. 212). Whereas, the writer continues (p. 216): "The human self in Him was not that of only one of us, but of us all. It was not one man but humanity that He was. We were every one present in Him: as, if we but knew it, He is present in us every one: and operative unto salvation in every one of us who believes and realizes His presence."

"It may now be asked, and unquestionably will be asked, how we shall go about conceiving the derivation from Mary of a human nature apart from a distinct human subject or personality. For my part, I might say that I do not go about it at all. What I am concerned about is simply the matter of Our Lord's person or personality, without any responsibility or competency for the question of how it came about. The Gospels do give us a most highly and beautifully poetical account of this, and the account assists me to imagine or picture to myself what I can in no wise explain or understand. I do not at all believe the one divine-human personality of Our Lord upon the authoritative statement of the story of His birth. Knowing Jesus Himself as He is known and revealed to us in the New Testament and in the mind and experience of the Church, I unhesitatingly recognize in Him—and the more, the more I know Him—no single man filled with God, but the fulness of the Godhead present and operative in all humanity" (p. 228).[1]

(iii) The third point can be very briefly stated. It is sometimes urged by defenders of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth that

[1] I quote this argument with all approval. But it is not an easy one to wield. It is generally recognized now that the weak point of the Chalcedonian Fathers' theology lay in their inevitably deficient understanding of what is meant by personality. And it appears that we are still waiting for a complete account of it. But, as far as I have been able to observe, philosophy is tending more and more to deny that there is such a thing as an "individual," while at the same time there is a disposition on the part of many who are not orthodox Christians to speak of Christ as "the soul of humanity." Dr. Du Bose himself meets the objection that the concept is difficult, as follows: "The universality of Our Lord's humanity is only explicable upon the fact that His personality is a divine one. It is only God in it that can make it applicable to all or the truth of all. . . . The concrete universal of humanity which may be found in Jesus Christ belongs to it not as humanity but as God in humanity. It is God in it which makes that particular humanity of Our Lord, His holiness, His righteousness, His life, valid and available for all; so that every man may find himself in Christ, and in Christ find himself" (*The Gospel according to St. Paul*, p. 297). See below, p. 214 f.

it is an illustration of the "Sacramental principle." To this the reply is fairly made that, although the Sacraments are a divine using of earthly material, they do not affect the physical order. But the rejoinder again is not difficult. The Incarnation is that of which the Church and Sacraments are derived "extensions." The initial consecrating step once taken, earth is a holy thing, and Sacraments are possible. But what made them possible?

(*b*) The Mythopœic Faculty.

Critics inevitably differ as to the extent to which they suppose that in any given case of this kind the mythopœic faculty has been at work. It may be conceded that as soon as the earthly career of any great hero, Messiah or what you will, is ended, that faculty, in an uncritical, pre-scientific age, will tend to come into operation. Those who believe that there was in the actual life of Jesus no miracle at all, will of course find very large traces of the operation of the faculty. Those who believe that an original minimum has been exaggerated, will no doubt have some criterion of their own by which to separate the true from the false. It will be most likely a mixture of the seeming appropriateness of the incidents related and the nature of their attestation. In this connexion attention may be directed to the Apocryphal Gospels, in which we see what the imagination and mythopœic faculty of the early Christians really could produce.

In the first place the Apocryphal Gospels are eager to go behind the Nativity, and to supply fantastic and marvellous details about the birth of Mary and her wonderful childhood, in which "she was not regarded as a little child, but as an adult of about thirty years, so earnest was she in prayer. . . . With the food that she received from the hand of the angel she refreshed herself alone; but she distributed to the poor the food which she received from the priests. The angels of God were frequently seen to talk with her, and they most diligently obeyed her. If any one that was sick touched her, that same hour he returned home whole" (*Ps.-Matthew*, vi.). The same writer enlarges, elaborately though not grossly, on the virginity of Mary, and describes how both Joseph and she were compelled to go through a sort of Ordeal, after which Mary said with a loud voice: "As the Lord Adonai

liveth . . . I have never known man ; but I am known by Him to Whom from infancy I have devoted my mind. . . . Then all began to kiss her feet, and to embrace her knees, praying her to pardon their evil suspicions " (*ibid.* xii.).

The writers leave little to the imagination. At the Annunciation, Mary was " not incredulous at these words of the angel, but wishing to know the mode of their accomplishment, asked : ' How can this be ? ' " (*Nativity of Mary*, ix.).

The Nativity itself abounds in miracles. It is without pain to the mother, and the Child is adored by the Ox and the Ass (*Ps.-Matthew*, xiii., xiv.). The hand of Salome, who is incredulous, is first withered and then restored (*Protevangelium Jacobi*, xx.). An old woman is cured of paralysis by placing her hands upon the Child, and goes out saying : " Henceforth will I be the handmaid and servant of this infant all the days of my life " (*Arabic Gospel of the Infancy*, iii.). A demoniac boy is healed by means of the swaddling clothes, " and the demons began to come forth out of his mouth, and fled in the form of crows and serpents " (*ibid.* xi.).

The silent years of the childhood and growth are filled with trivial and sometimes objectionable inventions—the commanding of dragons, the making of clay birds to fly, the killing and raising to life of other children, carrying water in a cloak, miraculous assistance to Joseph in the workshop, etc. Instead of the gradual advance " in wisdom and stature " (Lk. ii. 52), and the single hint that all who heard the Boy in the Temple " were amazed at His understanding and answers " (ii. 47), we have this, at five years of age : " Wonder ye at this that such things are spoken by a child ? Why then do ye not believe me in the things which I have spoken to you ? . . . I have seen Abraham, whom ye call your father, and talked with him, and he hath seen me. . . . I was among you with children, and ye knew me not. I have talked with you as with wise men, and ye have not understood my voice, because ye are inferior to me and of little faith " (*Ps.-Matthew*, xxx.). Or this : " He answered and explained to him physics and metaphysics, hyperphysics and hypophysics ; the virtues of the body ; also the humours and their effects ; also the number of the members and bones, veins, arteries, and nerves

. . . what the operation of the soul upon the body . . . and other things which the intellect of no creature attains unto" (*Arabic Gospel*, lii.). His teacher cries: "Ought he to live upon the earth? Verily, he deserves to be hanged on a great cross. . . . I flee before him, for I cannot endure the word of his mouth" (*Ps.-Matthew*, xxxi.). After the incident of the Temple: "The Scribes and Pharisees said, Art thou the mother of this child? And she said, I am. And they said to her, Blessed art thou among women, for God hath blessed the fruit of thy womb, in that he hath given thee such a glorious child and such a gift of wisdom, as we never saw or heard" (*Gospel of Thomas*, xv.).

Finally, the authors cannot resist the invention of coincidences. On the road to Egypt, Titus and Dumachus, the two robbers of the Crucifixion, are introduced and play appropriate parts. "And the Lord Jesus answered and said to his mother, After thirty years, O mother, the Jews will crucify me at Jerusalem, and these two robbers will be lifted on the cross with me, Titus at my right hand and Dumachus at my left, and after that day Titus shall go before me into Paradise. And when she had said, God avert this from thee, my son, they went thence to a city of idols, which, when they approached, was changed into heaps of sand." And again: A boy who was a demoniac "sought to bite the Lord Jesus, but he could not, yet he struck the right side of Jesus, who for this cause began to weep. Forthwith Satan went out of the boy in form like a mad dog. Now this boy, who struck Jesus, from whom Satan went out in the form of a dog, was Judas Iscariot, who betrayed him to the Jews, and that side of him on which Judas had smitten him, the Jews [*sic*] pierced with a spear" (*Arabic Gospel*, xxiii., xxxv.).[1] We may fairly say, with Dr. Armitage Robinson: "The frigid miracle-mongering of the so-called Gospels of the Infancy, when compared with the transparent honesty and delicate reserve of our Evangelists, offers one

[1] I use the translation of B. H. Cowper, *The Apocryphal Gospels*. All these documents, except the *Protevangelium Jacobi*, are of late date and no authority. With the exception of the *Protevangelium*, the existing portions of the comparatively early books, e.g. the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, the *Ebionite Gospel*, etc., do not touch upon this part of the subject, save as is indicated in the note at the end of this chapter. Part of the composite *Protevangelium* is early (it was perhaps known to Justin in 153), but it does not contain much legendary detail. Dr. Findlay's article "Gospels (Apocryphal)" in Hastings' *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels* is an admirable account of the subject.

of the most instructive contrasts in all literature." [1] The contrast is enough to reassure those who are impressed with the fact that S. Mark, the earliest Gospel, begins only with the Baptism,[2] and are thus led to wonder if the Nativity stories of S. Matthew and S. Luke are perhaps the imaginative products of a desire to satisfy devout demands. If I may borrow once again the words of Dr. Du Bose :

"If we should arrange the subject-matter of the Gospels in the order, not so much of the inherent relative importance of the different parts or topics, as of their actual influence in the production of these records, it would probably run as follows : (1) The death and resurrection. . . . (2) The public ministry. . . . (3) The baptism and its attendant circumstances. . . . (4) Latest of all arose the question of the point which even though first in reality would naturally come last in apprehension or investigation. While the order of things in themselves is always forward, the order of thought about things is backward, so that our last knowledge is that of adequate or sufficient causes. So Christianity may have rested for a moment upon the spiritual endowment of Jesus, as covered by His baptism or anointing with the Holy Ghost from heaven. But not for long ; the explanation was inadequate ; it was impossible to see in Jesus only a man approved of God by mighty works and wonders and signs. The deeper question of His person could not but follow after the others and gradually work its way to the front. As the record of His life had found it necessary to find a starting-point for the ministry in the acts and fact of the baptism, so it was not long in going back, behind S. Mark for example, to find a yet earlier beginning for itself in the account of His birth. S. John, we shall see, finds it necessary to go yet further back into the origin of things for sufficient

[1] *Some Thoughts on the Incarnation*, p. 38.

[2] Why does S. Mark begin with the Baptism ? There are three possible answers. (1) The life of power, which he wished to relate, did date from that point ; (2) he knew no traditions of the earlier period ; (3) he had not what we call the biographical motive —cp. the entire absence of any description of Our Lord's personal appearance or of any attempt to sum up His character. Of these answers (1) seems entirely true ; (2) has a considerable amount of truth in it, though, as V. M'Nabb shewed in *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, April 1907, his Gospel bears some testimony to the fact of the Virgin Birth ; and (3) is in itself true, though it is not easy to determine the precise weight that should be assigned to it as an explanation of his Gospel. There can be little doubt that all three reasons were more or less operative together.

antecedent and cause for His Gospel." (*The Gospel in the Gospels*, p. 210–211).

All this does not, of course, prove that S. Luke's narrative is true to fact. In the strict sense of proving, nothing can ever prove the truth of its central statement. But the argument does at least establish the reasonableness of the belief as maintained in the Christian Creed and in the Christian documents.

(*c*) Grace and Truth.

It is sometimes asserted that the inimitable beauty of the narrative proves that it is a legend. That, as an *a priori* statement, I entirely deny. S. Luke may be artistic, but so is God. There is, for example, a significant contrast between the birth of John and the birth of Jesus. The last prophet of the Jewish covenant is the child of aged parents. The Second Adam is the child of a young maiden. But the fact that S. Luke seems to have been aware of the significance of the contrast does not prove that he invented it. Again, we read the moving story of the Visitation: "When the voice of thy salutation came into mine ears the babe leaped in my womb for joy." It appeals, not because S. Luke alone thought of it, but because every one knows it, because it happens somewhere a thousand times a day; and it happens because God's in His heaven. We do not create the handiwork of the Almighty, we do but recognize it. Preachers draw out the fact that we have here the first response of creation to its Redeemer, and this is both true and beautiful. What are we to conclude from it? It may be admitted that the actual language of i. 43 ("mother of my lord") looks like an anachronism,[1] but on the general issue it is important to remember that the same God Who created the physiological law of which this is an instance, and the psychological capacity in Evangelist or preacher to appreciate its lesson, may also have furnished in this supreme instance a perfectly ordinary yet exquisitely classical illustration of His own universal law. It may be difficult for some minds to believe that Jesus was born of a pure virgin: it is no more difficult

[1] Even though it happens that the sentence comes in a form that is frequent in the New Testament and in common speech, but has no parallel in S. Luke. See Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, p. 201.

to believe the incident of the Visitation than it is to believe that He was born.

In the same way there is the Magnificat. It has been suggested that the hymn is a free composition of the Evangelist. In favour of that view there is the fact that ancient historians did not mind composing suitable *speeches* for their characters, and that S. Luke himself very likely did this very thing in the Acts. Against it there is the fact that if S. Luke did compose speeches for the Acts he probably knew at least that there had been speeches at those places, and it is not impossible that he had some record of their general tenor. It may well be that the balance, rhythm, and allusiveness of the actual language owes something to the later Church, perhaps even to S. Luke himself. But it is to be noted that the Magnificat is pre-Resurrection. It suits its place. It is Christian enough, being, in fact, as is well known, a Christianized and spiritualized version of the Song of Hannah, but it contains no anachronisms. Also there is the consideration that metrical compositions are more easily remembered than prose, and therefore if it can be believed that under the stress of a supreme emotion a Jewish maiden, unlearned but familiar with the Bible, and, I think we may add, of a singularly sweet and holy character, could improvise so marvellous a song, it was not impossible for that song to become traditional.

Once more, it is true that the old country priest, the shepherds, Simeon and Anna are characters who suit the Lukan Gospel. But do they not also suit the Nativity itself? There were such people, and that was the kind of environment which the Son of Man would choose. The incident of the Child Jesus in the Temple is capable of being used as an illustration of S. Luke's own view of Christianity. But may it not also be an illustration of the divine view?

For, after all, of what sort is the beauty of the narrative? Is it the beauty of conscious elaboration or of nature? "Events," said Maurice, "the belief of which has affected all the art and speculation of the most civilized nations of the modern world, are recorded in fewer words, and with less effort, than an ordinary historian would deem suitable to the account of the most trivial transaction. Such marvellous associations have clung for cen-

turies to these verses that it is hard to realize how absolutely naked they are of all ornament. We are obliged to read them again and again to assure ourselves that they really set forth what we call the great miracle of the world" (*The Kingdom of Heaven*, p. 28). Whatever ground there be, in any carefully selected black-list of theological writings, for Mr. Wells's castigation of "materialistic inventions about his 'miraculous' begetting and morbid speculations about virginity and the like that arise out of such grossness," S. Luke at least is not to be blamed.

(*d*) Idealization.

That there is an element other than literal truth in the narrative is, I think, to be admitted even by the most orthodox. It is, for example, not orthodox and must, I believe, be counted as heresy to assert that the angels have bodies. Therefore the appearance of the Angel Gabriel to the Virgin Mary was in the strict sense a vision. It would not necessarily have been seen at all by any other person who might have been present. I believe entirely that her experience was true; I mean that God sent it and that Mary took from it the impression that she was intended to take. I do not believe that the words, "Hail, thou that art highly favoured; the Lord is with thee," were spoken in audible tones, though I believe that they represent as nearly as human words can do the sense which Mary was intended to receive; and I believe that they were beyond the power of either Luke or Mary to invent, though their meaning was not beyond the power of Mary to apprehend. That experience, described so briefly, so simply, so plainly, yet without a single word that could offend the most delicate purity, I take to be the Conception of the Holy Child.[1]

[1] Sir W. M. Ramsay has some suggestive remarks: "Here we have a narrative which comes from a Hebrew source, from a woman thinking in Hebraic fashion, one whose language was saturated with Hebraic imagery. This narrative Luke has transmitted to us in a form which clearly shows its Hebrew origin, and equally clearly shows that it had been re-expressed in Lukan language, and transformed by Luke. But also, I venture to believe, it has been rethought out of the Hebraic into the Greek fashion. The messenger of God, who revealed to Mary the Divine will and purpose, becomes to Luke the winged personal being who, like Iris or Hermes, communicates the will and purpose of God. Exactly what is the difference between the original narrative and the Greek translation, I am not able to say or to speculate; but that there was a more anthropomorphic picture of the messenger in Luke's mind than there was in Mary's I feel no doubt. Yet I believe that Luke was translating as exactly as he could into

Nor need we hesitate to admit that the dialogue in general is only an approximation to what actually occurred. There would no doubt be a tradition that Zacharias had been disbelieving and that he had been rebuked for his unfaith. The, "How shall I know this?" and, "I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God," would be legitimate amplifications of the central idea. Again, the details of the scene at the naming of the infant John, and the actual words (ii. 15) put into the mouths of the shepherds are undoubtedly dramatic inventions, but it would be hazardous to deny or even to question their substantial truth. But the suggestion that the whole narrative is enveloped in poetic haze, which has only a remote relation to the truth, and that it represents the later conception of the Church read back, in ignorance or with assumed poetic licence, into the consciousness of Mary, may be dismissed, because there is very little sign of such a process in the New Testament. S. John's Gospel contains some anachronisms, e.g. the long disputes of Jesus "with the Jews" may include some anticipation of the controversies which the Church held with later Judaism, and the theological statements ascribed to Our Lord owe much to the subsequent reflections of the Evangelist himself. S. Matthew's Gospel here and there attributes to Our Lord's teaching an ecclesiastical precision which really was of somewhat later growth, and it may be that the picture of the Church in the first half of Acts is affected in a few points by later history, but an enlightened criticism finds very little trace of such a process in the Lukan account of the Nativity. It is perfectly true that anachronisms in plenty in connexion with the Nativity have found their way into the subsequent mind of the Church. Poetry and Mystery-Play have accustomed us, for example, to picture a degree of immediate comprehension on the part of the shepherds which is wholly improbable, but the anachronism has no Biblical authority. Sermons and hymns attach mystical meanings to the gifts of the Magi, but we have no sanction for so doing from S. Matthew's Gospel. The presentation of a little cross by the infant John to the infant Jesus is frankly a creation of mediæval artists.

Greek the account which he had heard. He expresses and thinks as a Greek that which was thought and expressed by a Hebrew" (*Luke the Physician*, p. 13; cp. *ibid.*, p. 255).

It remains only to consider briefly some part of the actual evidence.

It is not possible to deal here with the alleged "silence" of S. Paul and S. John. It can only be remarked that the assertion that there is any significance in their "silence," or even that they are "silent" on the subject, is precarious (e.g. Jn. i. 13 (*ἀνδρός*) and S. Paul's argument in 1 Cor. xv. 45–49, and his language in Galatians iv. 4, are at least congruous with the belief. And it seems certain that Jn. vi. 42, vii. 27, vii. 41, 42 are deliberate cases of Tragic Irony; cp. Lk. iv. 22). But the evidence of other parts of the Lukan writings does belong to our present subject.

The supposed difficulties are three:

(1) Was the fact known to the Apostles, and did it form part of the Apostolic preaching?

During Our Lord's earthly lifetime they did not know it. S. Peter on the Day of Pentecost can hardly have known it. If he had, it is far from certain that he would have proclaimed it. He did preach the Resurrection, because that was the thing of which he was himself the witness. But he did not proclaim, and probably at this time did not possess, any reasoned theory as to the *manner* of the Resurrection. That was expounded subsequently by S. Paul when occasion happened to arise. In the same way S. Peter announces in Acts i.–v. that a heavenly Christ has come into the world, but he is not concerned at present with Incarnation theology, still less with any doctrine of the manner of the Lord's Birth. And as for later times, those who are prepared to assert that the existing records of the Apostolic preaching (or of S. Paul's correspondence) represent all that they ever said will find it possible to argue that they had never heard of the Virgin Birth or that they disbelieved it, but the assumption is more than doubtful. It is admitted by all that the fact did not form part of the earliest missionary preaching. It is quite possible that it was not among the things in which Theophilus, for example, had been instructed. It was not the foundation, but part of the superstructure, of Christian belief.

(2) Was the fact known to the brethren of the Lord, and is the subsequent conduct of His Mother consistent with belief in the substantial accuracy of chapters i. and ii.?

Of the Brethren we know from Jn. vii. 5 that "they believed not in him." From Mk. iii. 21 (a verse omitted in S. Matthew and S. Luke) we learn that when "his friends" (*οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ*) heard that He had chosen twelve disciples and was becoming a centre of interest to "the multitude," they "came out to lay hold on him, for they said, He is beside himself." There is no mention of the Mother here, but in Mk. iii. 31 (Mt. xii. 46, and Lk. viii. 20) it is reported to Him, "Behold, thy mother and thy brethren without seek thee." [1]

What are we to make of this? It seems not unreasonable to say that in the course of thirty years even a very wonderful experience, which had not been renewed by any specific act of God, would have become less vivid to the mind of a peasant woman, and that it would therefore be very startling to find a son beginning to act in the way described. Our Lord did not at this stage claim publicly to be Messiah, and even if He had, His actions were not all easy to fit into the traditional Messianic rôle. There was, for instance, an element of "Nonconformity" about them, which may well have puzzled and even distressed the old-fashioned orthodoxy of the devout Mother. Further, it is to be remembered that the members of the Holy Family were "poor people." And "poor people" often need to hear a thing more than once before they comprehend it. The "Be it unto me according to thy word" cannot be said necessarily to involve complete understanding. It seems to us that so great a miracle as that indicated in the story must have made an overwhelming, ineffaceable impression. There could be no doubt or hesitation after that. But the miracle would not be nearly so "miraculous" to Mary as it is to us.

It is not necessary to dwell on the supposed inconsistencies in chapter ii., e.g. verse 33 ("his father and his mother"), 41 ("his parents"), 48 ("thy father and I"). The first two are purely conventional,[2] and the third is actually used to introduce a

[1] It seems just possible that the detail found only in S. Luke ("and they could not come at him for the crowd") was a recollection of the Mother herself.

[2] Canon Box in his admirable volume *The Virgin Birth of Jesus*, which is particularly valuable because of the writer's knowledge of Jewish literature, quotes (p. 5) from the Apocryphal *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew* (chap. xxvii.): "And some went away to the chief priests . . . and told them that Jesus *the son of Joseph* had done great signs, etc.," and notes that a few pages further on (chap. xxx.) Jesus is made to say, "But I am an alien in your courts, because I have no carnal parent."

delicate correction. Again, the words of *v.* 50 ("They understood not") are very far indeed from being a relic unskilfully retained, from an alien and discordant source. They are profoundly consistent with the narrative as a whole. They mean "The Child understands the mystery better than we do ourselves."

(3) Was the fact known to Our Lord Himself, and do His subsequent actions allow us to believe that it was true?

The "psychology of Jesus," and the "Messianic consciousness of Jesus" have been treated with such strange confidence by some writers that it is impossible not to feel the perils of an attempt to state what He did and did not know.[1] Yet the attempt must be made. We know from Lk. ii. 52 that He "advanced in wisdom," and from Heb. v. 8 that He "learned obedience by the things that he suffered." And for my own part I do not feel certain that our Saviour knew the facts of His own Birth. I cannot at all events assert it as unquestionable. But assuming that He did, we cannot infer that He would proclaim it. We may, in fact, infer the opposite. It is clear from the Temptation that He knew Himself to be Messiah, but He does not publicly proclaim the fact.

The inquiry is perhaps unprofitable and may seem irreverent. But I cannot think that the "silence" of Our Lord about His Birth constitutes any reason to doubt the historicity of the Christian tradition. Bearing in mind the general nature of His appeal to men, and in particular His attitude towards His own miracles, we may fairly say that an argument from the circumstances of His Birth was precisely the sort of argument that He would not use.

The slightly different version of the same question which forms the second half of our supposed difficulty seems more urgent. "The full consciousness of Sonship," says Dr. McNeile, seems to have come to Him at the Baptism" (*Gospel of St. Matthew*, p. xxiv.). Anyhow, it is agreed that the Baptism represents a considerable stage in our Saviour's vocation. It was the point from which He took up His public Ministry, and His Temptation, which immediately follows it, is most easily explained by supposing

[1] E.g. I have been *inter alios* rebuked by one of my own pupils, who remarked "so many lecturers quote passages of the Gospels and then say, 'What Our Lord *really* meant was so-and-so.'"

that He then was conscious for the first time of the possession of superhuman power. Nor is this wonderful. If we assume, as upon Christian grounds we must assume, that His Infancy and Childhood were a real infancy and a real childhood, there must have come a time when His adult Manhood was at length ready for the work which the Father had given Him to do. And the arrival of this time was clearly marked by the Baptism.

But to make any sort of return to the ancient heresy that Jesus only began to be the Son of God at His Baptism is surely impossible. If we are to find in the Life which is recorded in the Gospels a Redemption of Mankind, if it be true that in Jesus God re-created human nature, the re-creating and redeeming process must have begun when the human substance of the Redeemer was yet unperfect, while His members day by day were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them. The classical expression of man's need of Redemption is that of the Miserere, "Behold, I was shapen in wickedness and in sin hath my mother conceived me," and it seems to follow that the remedy must go at least as deep as the disease. We shall not be wrong if we say, with a modern disciple of Jesus who has had singular opportunities of studying the nature of his fellow-men: "God laid His hand on the deepest spring of man's being when His Son came to us 'conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.'" [1]

NOTE ON THE READING IN S. LUKE iii. 22

The "Western" text, i.e. D (Codex Bezæ), the Old Latin Versions, Justin (*C. Tryph.*, 89 and 103), Augustine (*De Cons. Evv.*, ii. 14), and some other patristic citations, read: "Thou are my Son; this day have I begotten thee." The *Ebionite Gospel*, quoted in Epiph., *Hær.*, xxx. 13, combines the "Western" and the ordinary reading, "Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased. And again: To-day have I begotten thee . . . and again a voice came from heaven to him (John): This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

The "Western" text looks like the primitive reading, and it is thought (Harnack, *Sayings*, p. 314; *Oxford Studies*, p. 187) that it must have stood in Q. Otherwise S. Luke would not change the version that he found in Mk. Further, it looks as if it came originally from some circle in which there was no doctrine of the Virgin Birth. This is in itself probable enough. But there are some other considerations which prevent absolute certainty on the point.

(1) All Greek MSS. (except D), and the Old Syriac Version, have the received text.

(2) The "Western" reading is a quotation (Ps. ii. 7), and there would be a natural tendency to assimilate the Gospel words to the known language of the Old Testament.

[1] Father Paul Bull, *God and our Soldiers*, p. 244.

This tendency, however, has not operated in the other Gospels, nor in the similar passage in the account of the Transfiguration.

(3) Ps. ii. 7 was a commonplace of Christian quotation. This verse is quoted in Acts xiii. 33; Hebr. i. 5, v. 5; and the Psalm in Acts iv. 25; Apoc. ii. 27, xii. 5, xix. 15.

(4) The reference in Acts xiii. 33 is to the Resurrection (cp. Rom. i. 4; Phil. ii. 9), not to the Baptism. Hebr. v. 5 is perhaps general, perhaps to the Ascension (cp. iv. 14). "There are three moments to each of which are applied with variations the words of Ps. ii. 7: 'Thou are my Son; this day have I begotten thee.' They are (i) the Baptism (Mk. i. 11 ||); (ii) the Transfiguration (Mk. ix. 7 ||); (iii) the Resurrection (Acts xiii. 33). We can see here the origin of the Ebionite idea of progressive exaltation, which is, however, held in check by the doctrine of the Logos in both its forms, Pauline (2 Cor. iv. 4, etc.) and Johannean (Jn. i. 1 ff.). The moments in question are so many steps in the passage through an earthly life of One Who came forth from God and returned to God, not stages in the gradual deification of one who began his earthly career as ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος" (Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 9).

PART III

THE WORKMANSHIP

CHAPTER XIII

S. LUKE THE PSYCHOLOGIST [1]

We have seen something of the environment of S. Luke's Gospel and the background from which it emerges. We have noted its contents, and some points in the character of the Master. We have spent some time on the examination of the sources of the portrait. It remains to consider the nature of the artist's workmanship. The first point to come before us is the insight into Nature, both Divine and human, which the Evangelist displays.[2] A learned theologian remarked not long ago that of the four Evangelists S. Luke was the one whom he would most gladly meet. He felt that S. Mark and S. Matthew had already told us what they could. "S. John," he said, "was a saint, but I think I know the kind of thing that he would say to me. But S. Luke is different. He was not a saint. He was a psychologist. I should like to meet him."

"A psychologist among the Saints." When some one said, forty years ago, "We do not attack religions: we explain them," he was anticipating, with rather more bitterness than the event has justified, what is now called religious psychology. He was mistaken in supposing that the process, of which he saw only the merest germ, would be destructive of religion. But there was this much truth in his anticipation: the scientific study of religion has, to a considerable extent, been carried on by those who have observed it from without. The psychologist is, as a rule, a person who, armed himself with an equable detachment,

[1] The substance of this chapter appeared in the *Interpreter*, Jan. 1917, and is now reprinted by kind permission of the Editor.

[2] Loisy, who has a surprisingly unfavourable estimation of the Lukan style ("inégal, maniéré, on oserait presque dire truqué"), and speaks of the dedication to Theophilus as "pompeuse et banale," nevertheless finds the charm of the Gospel in "une certaine note psychologique, un sens profond des choses de l'âme, un ton pénétré, ce je ne sais quoi qui vient du cœur et qui touche le cœur" (*Les Évangiles synoptiques*, i, p. 260).

surveys and analyses human nature. He is interested in streams of tendency, but he is not carried away by them. He welcomes what seems to be a personality, and is glad to explore it, but he does not fall down and worship it. In his distrust of cant, hypocrisy, and sentimentality he is sometimes unduly disparaging of sentiment. He is too scientific not to allow for religion, but he is sometimes unscientific enough to think that he can explain it. His methods of investigation are acute and delicate: his temper scrupulously just. He has perceived the inadequacy of mere counting: he weighs and analyses: he has even summoned imagination to his aid. But there are still some secrets which faith only could reveal to him.

S. Luke was certainly a psychologist in some senses of the word. He was by nature detached and equable. He was interested in humanity: he was accustomed to survey it, and, as far as contemporary methods enabled him, to analyse it. He was, in fact, what used to be called, before the word "psychology" was invented, a philosopher. To what extent he had the defects of the philosophic temperament, equable to the point of an inhuman neutrality, cool to the degree of being cold-blooded, will never be known. Because, if he had, his experience was such as to redeem his character. For it happened that he was converted. He fell in love with Jesus. From being interested in the singular case of one Paul, a travelling sophist, whose restless zeal already begins to play havoc with his constitution, he passed to the consideration of the still more unusual case of "one Jesus, who was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive" (Acts xxv. 19).

It is often said that the manner of regarding the Saints of the Church is right or wrong, according as it views them in connexion with or apart from Our Lord, the King of Saints. If this be so, it is certain that the physician's attitude towards the object of his immediate admiration did not blind him to that which lay beyond. It is not difficult to see that he is something of a Paulinist; but he can hardly write a sentence without revealing that he is a Christian. He is not, indeed, a formal theologian. Like those Corinthian Christians "who had believed through grace" (Acts xviii. 27), the Evangelist from time to time found that the learning of an Apollos was a powerful reinforcement.

But in the beginning he had believed through grace. And there is no doubt of S. Luke's devotion to his Master. In fact, this chapter is largely concerned with some respects in which he was, among psychologists, exceptional.

It has been said of the famous brothers, William and Henry James, that the one wrote psychology like a novel, and that the other wrote novels like psychology. Each, in fact, is what he might be expected to be, and something more. Is it possible, without irreverence, to adapt the epigram, and say that S. Luke was an Evangelist who was also a psychologist and a psychologist who also wrote a Gospel ? [1]

For in his Gospel it is possible to see how the detached observer was carried away by admiration. The leading characteristic of his Gospel is the devotion of the author to his Hero. He has other minor but not unconnected admirations for aspects of Our Lord's message, which he shows by his description of certain types, but his main object is to draw a picture of the Son of Man. His biography is inspired, as were the biographies of Plutarch and other ancient writers, by the motive called in Latin *pietas*.

One of the best ways to obtain a general view of S. Luke's picture of Our Lord is to examine the incident (iv. 16–30) with which he begins his account of his ministry. It is as follows :

" And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up ; and he entered, as his custom was, into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up to read. (17) And there was delivered

[1] The importance of psychology as an illuminant for theologians is increasingly recognized. See, for example, some striking remarks in Prof. Lake's *Earlier Epistles*, p. 241 f. Note especially : " If I do not mistake the signs of the times, the really serious controversy of the future will be concerned with this point, even among those who are agreed in assigning the highest value to religion, and [that] the opposing propositions will be : (1) That religion is the communion of man, in the sphere of the subliminal consciousness, with some other being higher than himself ; (2) that it is communion of man with his own subliminal consciousness, which he does not recognize as his own, but hypostatizes as some one exterior to himself. Those who wish to prepare for this controversy will do well to study on the one hand the facts of religion—not of theology—and on the other the principles of psychology " (p. 251). The adequacy of the word " subliminal " in (1) is very questionable. The speculations of Dr. Sanday's *Christologies—Ancient and Modern* have not been generally accepted, and while it may be allowed that the subliminal may be a genuine and important sphere of communion with God, it seems better to look for the truest communion at a level of rational consciousness.

unto him the book of the prophet Isaiah. And he opened the book, and found the place where it was written,

> The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, Because he anointed
> me to preach good tidings to the poor:
> He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives,
> And recovering of sight to the blind,
> To set at liberty them that are bruised.
> To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.[1]

And he closed the book and gave it back to the attendant, and sat down: (20) and the eyes of all in the synagogue were fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears. (22) And all bare him witness, and wondered at the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth: and they said, Is not this Joseph's son? (23) And he said unto them, Doubtless ye will say unto me this parable, Physician, heal thyself: whatsoever we have heard done at Capernaum, do also here in thine own country. And he said, Verily I say unto you, No prophet is acceptable in his own country. But of a truth I say unto you, There were many widows in Israel in the days of Elijah, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when there came a great famine over all the land: (26) and unto none of them was Elijah sent, but only to Zarephath, in the land of Sidon, unto a woman that was a widow. And there were many lepers in Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet; and none of them was cleansed, but only Naaman the Syrian. And they were all filled with wrath in the synagogue, as they heard these things; and they rose up, and cast him forth out of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might throw him down headlong. But he passing through the midst of them went his way."

It is an incident peculiar to this Gospel, and it brings out

[1] It has often been noticed that the quotation ends without including the severe conclusion of the original, "and the day of vengeance of our God" (Is. lxi. 2). Irenæus considers and rejects the argument that the use of the singular number ("year") implies a ministry of twelve months only. It is not impossible that this may have been S. Luke's opinion, as it was that of Clement of Alexandria and Origen, but the complicated evidence (see Turner in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, art. "Chronology of the New Testament") points rather to a period of about two years.

many of its characteristic features. "He went to Nazareth, where he had been brought up." Here is the link with the early chapters, and the willingness of the Master—an example which was perhaps followed by the Evangelist himself—to begin preaching where He was known. And yet on the other hand the passage immediately enlarges the idea of home; it shews that the supposed son of Joseph (*v.* 22) is not as His brethren, but belongs to a larger world, with a wider definition of brotherhood. And also its scene is Judæa in the larger, less strictly Jewish, sense, a sense in which S. Luke several times uses the actual word "Judæa," as including the semi-Gentile Galilee. The sermon begins (*v.* 17), as a Jewish sermon should, with the Old Testament, but the text is from Isaiah, the most Evangelical and the most universalist of prophets. The quotation brings out two things, Our Lord's sense of mission and the fact that His message was especially for the poor and the oppressed. Both points are highly characteristic of S. Luke. It is, perhaps, fanciful to insist on the fact that the book is closed after it has served as the introduction to a sermon, and it is, perhaps, an unimportant detail that the eyes of the congregation are said (*v.* 20) to have been fixed on the preacher. But the word for "fixed" is a favourite Lukan word, and it is beyond question part of S. Luke's plan to record the deep impression that Our Lord made on all sorts of people.[1] But the main point of the paragraph is the single sentence in which the whole sermon is summed up, "To-day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." One of our Evangelist's favourite thoughts is that many of the traditional elements in the Messiah picture were actually realized in the earthly life of Jesus: where the King is, there is the kingdom. The description of the sermon, "the words of grace that proceeded out of his mouth," is again Lukan. The proverb quoted in *v.* 23 is found only here, and it, perhaps, appealed with special force to the physician. The Old Testament examples of the woman of Sarepta and Naaman the Syrian, again peculiar to this Gospel, are from the more liberal parts of the Old Testament.[2]

[1] Cp. iv. 15, ix. 43, xviii. 43, xix. 37, cases where the point is made by S. Luke only.

[2] In verse 26 Wellhausen for "widow" would read "Aramæan," i.e. Gentile. The two words in Aramaic are almost identical.

And, finally, the failure of the attempted violence and the passing of the victim unharmed through their midst is due to the fact, continuously realized by Our Lord and from time to time hinted by the Evangelist, that His hour was not yet come.

Such, then, was the episode with which S. Luke has chosen to begin his story of the ministry. But it is time to review the elements of his picture on a larger scale.

There is, first of all, the element of mystery. At the end of his account (v. 26) of the forgiving and healing of the paralytic, whom he describes by the correct medical term (*παραλελυμένος*), and not the popular expression of the other Evangelists, S. Luke adds, "And fear took hold upon them all, and they glorified God, and they were filled with fear, saying, We have seen strange things to-day." This is much more typical than is sometimes supposed. For it is often suggested that, whereas S. Matthew exhibits the Royal Lion of the tribe of Judah, S. Mark, in Professor Burkitt's words, "a mysterious and stormy Personage," and S. John, as all know, a figure obviously divine, S. Luke's Gospel, with the Parable of the Good Samaritan as its characteristic feature, is the plain record of the philanthropic Jesus. But his record is only plain with the plainness of careful and consummate portraiture, and his Jesus is an overwhelming Personality.

S. Luke, in one sense, is not a theologian; that is, he does not publicly expound his theological beliefs, and, Pauline as he is, in his long narrative of the Passion he excludes all reference to the theology of the Cross. And it sometimes seems as if he felt that a difficult problem *solvitur ambulando*. Thus, he may have recorded with a special appreciation that word of the Lord which appears only in his Gospel (xii. 29), "Neither be ye of doubtful mind."[1] It is he alone who tells (xiii. 1) how Our Lord deprecated what would have been a barren philosophical inquiry into the case of the eighteen on whom the tower fell, by means of the practical warning, "I say unto you, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish."

But his own belief is sufficiently suggested.[2] With the other

[1] *μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε*. Cf. xiii. 23, 24.

[2] "In Christology S. Luke approaches to the Johannine type" (Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, p. 226).

Synoptists, he relates (viii. 25) the story of "Who then is this, that he commands the winds and the sea and they obey Him?" It is the first stage in a process that has occasionally been regretted, but was quite inevitable, the transformation of Syrian peasants against their will into philosophers and theologians. The first stage is very simple. They are impressed. They have no dogma, no theory, no formula. They shake their heads and say, "Well, it beats us to understand." It is the beginning of the creed.[1] A second stage in the process of the education of the disciples is the Transfiguration (ix. 28–36), where we may note especially—"they feared as they entered into the cloud" (34), and—"they held their peace and told no man in those days any of the things which they had seen" (36). The third stage is the final one. It is elaborately prepared for by the long account (ix. 51–xix. 28, which is almost all peculiar to S. Luke) of the going up to Jerusalem. Its significance is revealed to all who are willing to perceive it in the Palm Sunday Entrance (xix. 29–44), and to some who are unwilling to perceive it in—"if thou art the Christ, tell us plainly. And he said to them, If I tell you, ye will not believe. And if I ask you ye will not answer. And from now there shall be the Son of Man seated on the right hand of the power of God. And all said, Art thou, then, the Son of God? And he said to them, Ye say that I am. And they said, What further need have we of witness? For we ourselves have heard from his own mouth" (xxii. 67–71).

But on the other hand he will not overstate. For example, S. Matthew and S. Mark relate that the centurion at the Cross said, when all was over, "Truly, this was the Son of God." There is, of course, no possibility that he meant what we mean by such words. He was a pagan, and he meant "a son of the gods," "a demigod," "no ordinary man," "there's more in this than meets the eye." S. Luke, himself a Greek, would appreciate this, and, lest he should seem to encourage an illegitimately theological idea, he interprets, "Truly, this was a righteous man" (xxiii. 47).

An isolated touch occurs in viii. 39, "Go unto thy house and tell what great things God hath done for thee. And he departed,

[1] This point is admirably dealt with by Dr. Bethune Baker in *Cambridge Theological Essays*, p. 544 f.

proclaiming throughout all the city what things *Jesus had done for him.*" There are profound passages like x. 18, "I beheld Satan fall from heaven as lightning," spoken on the return of the Seventy. This has been thought to refer to the Temptation, or to the original fall of Satan, but it probably means, "While you were on your mission you were but reaping the fruits of My concentration here. I wrestled with the demons, and so they were exorcised at your word." But, whatever be the interpretation of it, the passage has an unearthly and mysterious ring.[1] Then there is Our Lord's comparison of Himself to one stronger than the strong man armed (xi. 22), there is the declaration (xii. 51), highly characteristic of this Gospel, that He came not to bring peace but division upon the earth (S. Luke is peculiarly alive to the necessity, which conversion may produce, of sundering old ties and old relations), and there is the famous—"All things have been delivered to me by My Father" (x. 22), followed immediately by—"many prophets and kings have desired to see the things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear the things which ye hear, and have not heard them."

There is the frequent use of the argument *a fortiori*, of which Mr. Chesterton has said, "Christ had even a literary style of his own, not to be found, I think, elsewhere; it consists of an almost furious use of the *a fortiori*. His 'how much more' is piled one upon another like castle upon castle in the clouds" (*Orthodoxy*, p. 269). It appears not infrequently in S. Luke, and it is, undoubtedly, one of the cases in which both he and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who has affinities with him,[2] have imitated the Master's style. There is, for example, the parable of the friend at midnight (xi. 5), which is Lukan only, and the analogies of father and son and bread and stone, which he has in common with S. Matthew, though he gives the conclusion a characteristic turn, "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much

[1] "What He meant was that the victory over the Power of Evil was virtually won. The healing of those few demoniacs might seem a small thing . . . it was really a crisis—*the* crisis in the history of the human race" (Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 111).

[2] It has occasionally been thought that S. Luke was the author of the Epistle. But the theory will not bear examination.

more will your Father in Heaven give" (not "good gifts," as S. Matthew but) "holy spirit to them that ask him?" There is the allusion (xi. 20) to the exorcising of demons by the Jews, followed by "But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you." There is Our Lord's description of Himself as a greater than Solomon and a greater than Jonah (xi. 31–32). There is the famous "If God so clothe the grass" (xii. 28), and there is the Lukan parable of the Unjust Judge (xviii. 2) with the superlative conclusion, "And shall not God avenge His own elect?"

In his account of the Transfiguration (ix. 28–36) S. Luke makes his psychological contrast in a paradoxical but deeply Christian way. We know how S. Paul overcame the great offence, and turned what seemed to be a shame into a glory. Not even the most exalted moment of the Jewish dispensation was one-tenth so splendid as that in Christianity which the Jews dismissed as infamous. "The children of Israel could not look stedfastly at the face of Moses because of the glory of his face." But this was but a transitory glory. The real, abiding glory is that of the New Order, of the Kingdom, of the Church, of the Spirit, of Pentecost, of Christ. "If that which passeth away was with glory, much more that which remaineth is in glory" (2 Cor. iii. 7–11). The real glory is that which radiates from the Crucified. Moses was "a prince and a great man in Israel." His Law was a tutor to lead men onwards. Mount Sinai was where man had heard the voice of God. Again, the later hill of Zion was "a fair place," and "the joy of the whole earth." But the still later hill of Calvary was the place of

"The light that shone when Hope was born."

The surpassing glory was the glory of the Cross.

So is it with the Transfiguration. Moses and Elijah are the representatives of the Law and the Prophets. When they appear in glory and speak with Him Who is the End of the Law and the Meaning of the Prophets, they speak, in S. Luke's version, "of His decease which He should shortly accomplish at Jerusalem." And yet it is S. Luke only who refers (xi. 43) to that "majesty," in which the author of 2 Peter, who has so

much to say about the Transfiguration, finds (i. 16) its characteristic note.

Finally, there is the Lukan account of the Last Supper (xxii. 15–20). It is a Passover, and much more than a Passover. The experience of the Twelve is the experience of many disciples since, who have come expecting a bare Memorial, and have found, according to the measure of their discernment, the Body of the Lord. A few bewildered men are expecting to bind themselves in sad obedience to preserve a tragic memory, and they are bidden to look forward to the new wine of Resurrection and Eternal Life. The Last Passover is transfigured into a Eucharist of praise.[1]

One of the penalties of greatness is loneliness. The great artist is, perhaps, never understood by his contemporaries. The consummate Artist has twelve pupils, but they do not penetrate His secret. And the Evangelist, himself an artist, has not failed to indicate this in his picture. One of the chief impressions taken from the Gospel is that Our Lord lived alone. We perhaps may not say that it is S. Luke who expands the story of the Garden of Gethsemane to include the agony and the more earnest prayer, the sweat of blood and the Angel who supplies ministrations which might have been given by the Twelve,[2] though the genuineness of xxii. 43, 44 is accepted by Harnack as "very probable" (*Luke the Physician*, p. 194). But it is he who records the wistful "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you that he might sift you as wheat, but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not" (xxii. 31). It is he who tells, a few verses later, how the disciples said in their stolid,

[1] Most critics now agree that S. John's Gospel (xiii. 1, xviii. 28) is right in suggesting that the Last Supper was not, strictly speaking, the Passover. The Passover lamb was not slain till the following (Friday) afternoon, the time at which Our Lord was dying on the Cross. The Synoptic Gospels (e.g. Lk. xxii. 7–13, especially *v.* 7) do certainly state that the meal was the Passover, but there are some indications (e.g. the carrying of arms, Lk. xxii. 52) which make it clear that the Passover season had not really begun. The solution probably is that the Last Supper was regarded by the Master and His disciples as *their* Passover, i.e. an anticipation, in the special circumstances, of what would ordinarily have taken place on the following night. It would thus be celebrated with unleavened bread only, and without a lamb, which was not an essential feature. This perhaps explains the "with desire have I desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer" of Lk. xxii. 15.

[2] The Lukan addition is not found in full in all the MSS. But it is generally allowed to be a piece of genuine tradition, even though, like the incident of Jn. vii. 53–viii. 11, it may not belong to its place in the *textus receptus*.

faithful, uncomprehending way, "Lord, here are two swords": and He said, half tragic, half playful, and altogether loving, misunderstood but not misunderstanding, "It is enough." And at an earlier period, after the second prediction of the Passion (ix. 45), S. Luke relates, "They knew not this saying, and it was hid from them that they should not perceive it, and they feared to ask him concerning this saying." And again after the third prediction (xviii. 34), "They understood none of these things, and this saying was hid from them, and they knew not the things which were said." It is not, I think, for nothing that S. Luke introduces his account of S. Peter's confession (ix. 18) with "It came to pass that as he was praying *by himself*." He trod the winepress alone. What the Provost of Oriel said to Newman—"*Nunquam minus solus quam cum solus*"—was doubtless supremely true of Jesus, but this is a tragic variation of the thought—*Solus etiam inter discipulos*. S. Luke also records the touching parable of the children playing in the market-place, that perpetual, futile excuse of the conventional—that if only the original, creative genius had come in some already accepted, recognizable form they would have been only too happy to accept and recognize it. S. Luke tells this in common with S. Matthew, but in the conclusion which points the irony and points also to the ultimate solution, he adds one single word, "And yet wisdom was justified of *all* her children" (vii. 34).

It is not, of course, claimed that S. Luke understood all the pathos and all the glory of Our Lord's life, that he was fully sensitive to the whole wonder of its sweetness and its tragedy and its triumph. He has affinities with the Fourth Evangelist, but he is not a John. He misses even some of the points which S. Mark—whether by accident of date or design of workmanship—has preserved for us. He gives us little help in the attempt to trace development in Our Lord's life and thought. He softens a few hard-seeming corners, which, if they be truths of fact, must also be truths of Revelation. Thus, there are several human touches in S. Mark which our Evangelist omits, perhaps from motives of reverence. But there are also one or two mysterious touches which he might have been expected to incorporate. Notably Mk. x. 32, "And they were in the way, going up to

Jerusalem, and Jesus was going before them, and they that followed were afraid." We do not know how S. Luke can have borne to omit so vivid a fragment of reality, but there is enough to enable us to say that the Lukan Christ, of all persons the most approachable, was yet not approached. Though His love was "broader than the measures of man's mind," though the heart of the Eternal, then as ever, was "most wonderfully kind," though He was the Saviour Who bore the burden of the world, yet He experienced in the days of His flesh something of that which may be called, perhaps unworthily and foolishly, but not altogether inexcusably, the loneliness of God.

CHAPTER XIV

S. LUKE THE ARTIST

MUCH of what might naturally appear under this title has been said already in earlier chapters. Our task here is chiefly to consider the Evangelist as a master of style. The author of "the most beautiful book in the world" was a literary artist.

It appears in the boldness with which he conceived the plan of writing two [1] books (or perhaps three) [2] about Christian origins. The conception of a written record of the doings of the Apostles was (as far as we know) a complete and startling novelty, and though he had predecessors in the earlier part of his two-volume narrative, yet there was in him enough initiative to make him recast his material and use his Markan and other sources according to his own design. For example, he completes his account of the life of the Baptist before proceeding to relate the Ministry of the Lord, whereas S. Mark, followed by S. Matthew, records the death of John in its chronological place. S. Luke's own design in the case of the Gospel was perhaps not quite so masterly as

[1] "The words 'concerning those matters which have been fulfilled among us' seem strangely poor and indefinite, if they refer only to the life and work of Jesus Christ. An inclusive phrase, on the other hand, was necessary if the subject-matter both of the Gospel and the Acts was within the writer's purview. Again, the two sides of the characteristics claimed for the primary witness become in this view full of significance. Their qualification as 'eye-witnesses' is important mainly in relation to the events of the Lord's life and, we may add, of the Day of Pentecost; their qualification as 'ministers of the word' is concerned rather with the story of Apostolic work. Once more, whatever difficulty may be felt in interpreting the words 'to write unto thee *in order*'—a phrase implying some kind of chronological arrangement (cp. Acts xi. 4)—when it is understood to apply only to S. Luke's Gospel, vanishes at once if the reference is to the whole course of the long history which began with the birth of the Baptist and ended with the sojourn of S. Paul in Rome" (Chase, *Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 16–17; cp. von Soden, *Early Christian Literature*, p. 211).

[2] It is possible that he contemplated a third book which should carry on the Christian story to the end of S. Paul's life. But this is only conjecture. The word πρῶτον in Acts i. 1 is sometimes appealed to as evidence. In classical Greek it would mean the first of more than two, but in S. Luke's time the distinction between πρῶτος and πρότερος was not observed.

in his other book. In Acts he has the advantage of first-hand knowledge and an infinitely smaller subject, but in his Gospel he at least has ascertained clearly and describes faithfully how the little seed grew into the great tree. We have seen already that he likes to bring his narrative into connexion with the history of the great world. That perhaps was to be expected. But the marvel is that he was able to catch the setting of the little world from which the Gospel sprang. It is wonderful indeed that a man who had not known Jesus in the flesh could have written the book that he has written. In this supreme delineation of the Saviour of the world, a Greek-speaking Gentile, a product of the Pauline teaching, has been able to reconstruct the atmosphere of Judaism and to do justice to the *Praeparatio Evangelica* of the Temple, of Moses and the Prophets.

Yet the Evangelist constantly bears in mind the requirements of the reader and the readers whom he is addressing. He is writing to Gentiles, and he is careful to explain (xx. 27) that the Sadducees are "they who say that there is no resurrection," that "the feast of unleavened bread" is called the Passover (xxii. 1). He avoids Hebrew terms like "Rabbi," [1] "Corban," "Ephphatha," "Hosanna"; he speaks of the scribes as "lawyers" (vii. 30, x. 25, xi. 45, 53, xiv. 3); he translates the obscure term "Cananean" to the more intelligible "zealot" (vi. 15); in his description of the Transfiguration he avoids the word "was metamorphosed," which has heathen associations. He renders S. Matthew's "publicans" and "gentiles" (v. 46, 47) by "sinners" (vi. 32) to avoid allusions which would be perplexing and perhaps offensive to any but a Jewish reader. His phrase in viii. 15 recalls irresistibly the well-known Greek equivalent for the modern word "gentleman." [2]

In another way, his narrative has an artistic purpose. He "seems to see, as the main obstacles to the Faith, not 'hypocrisies' nor Jewish backsliding, but the temptations of wealth and social position acting upon half-hearted converts; and his

[1] For "Rabbi," "Rabboni," he substitutes "Master" (ἐπιστάτα).

[2] "An honest and good heart" is not adequate as a rendering of καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ. Nothing but a paraphrase would really serve. Psalm xv., or what was said about Dean Church at the time of his election to an Oriel Fellowship, "There is such a moral beauty about Church that they could not help taking him," are illustrations of the meaning. καλὸς κἀγαθός is common in Plato and other Greek writers.

sayings about 'building the tower,' 'putting the hand to the plough,' 'renouncing all one's possessions,' and 'hating' father and mother are pathetic indications of what must have been going on in the divided household of many a young 'Theophilus.'"[1]

More generally, the literary capacity of S. Luke appears in innumerable points of style. It is not always easy to appreciate these in the English version. But his conversations will repay close study. We have seen already that many of the parables in his Gospel arise out of a casual question or allusion.[2] Here are a few cases of the skill with which he manages his dialogue. In the parable of the Good Samaritan (x. 25–37) the lawyer had asked, "Who is my neighbour, i.e. Who has a claim on me? Shew me some person whom I may fairly be expected to assist." But Our Lord asks in return, "Which now of these three *was neighbour* unto him that fell among the thieves?" In the Prodigal Son (xv. 11–32), "This thy son, which hath devoured thy living with harlots" becomes "this thy brother, which was dead and is alive again, which was lost and is found." In xx. 16 S. Luke alone records that the "God forbid," which follows the condemnation pronounced upon the wicked husbandmen, was a spontaneous exclamation of the hearers of the parable. And in xix. 25 it seems probable that the "Sir, he has ten pounds" is a like tribute to the entrancing interest of the story.[3]

The Evangelist's choice of words is, of course, very often not his own. Those pregnant phrases like "the tombs of the prophets" (xi. 47) and "widows' houses" (xx. 47), which have been seized by modern dramatists in search of epigrammatic titles, are due not to S. Luke but to his Master. But S. Luke in his own narrative has a gift of words. He is not altogether free from a common convention of ancient literature, by which the same words are baldly used a second time when the same meaning needs to be expressed. An example of this is xviii. 4, but the Evangelist errs, if it be an error, in company with Homer. But in v. 25 he shews that he has the modern feeling for variety. And in xv. 21 and xix. 22 the repetition is artistic. In xxiii. 48, 49

[1] Dr. Abbott in *Encycl. Bibl.*, ii. 1792.

[2] It is possible that in his fondness for recording "table-talk" (vii. 36 f., xi. 37 f., xiv. 1 f.) S. Luke was influenced by his knowledge of the *symposia* of Greek literature.

[3] See also v. 4–10, vii. 40–50, x. 25–30, 40–42, xiii. 12–17, xiv. 3–6, xix. 1–10.

he notes that the majority of the bystanders had come out "to be spectators" of an unusual spectacle, while His acquaintance and the women that followed Him from Galilee "saw" in what was done the crucifixion of their hopes.[1]

Some of his polishings of the rough Markan style have already been noted in chapter ix. A few more may be mentioned here. He avoids the perpetual "and . . . and . . . and" which is characteristic of S. Mark: he avoids the frequent "straightway." He changes S. Mark's constant "historic presents" into a more pleasing variety of tenses. He drops out non-literary words.[2] He smoothes a rough sentence in xx. 5, 6 (Mk. xi. 31, 32), and corrects an awkward Hebraism in xi. 29 (Mk. viii. 12). He elucidates an obscure sentence in xx. 38 (Mk. xii. 27).

A fair number of his words and phrases are definitely medical, and can be paralleled from Hippocrates and similar writers.[3] Dr. Hobart in *The Medical Language of St. Luke* collected no less than four hundred instances. The great majority of these are either quite common Greek words or words that occur in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, for which there is no need to postulate any specifically medical provenance. But there remain quite enough to make it extremely likely that the Evangelist was familiar with professional medical terminology. The most interesting examples in the Gospel are iv. 23, where S. Luke alone has "You will quote to me this saying, Physician, heal thyself"[4]; v. 31, where for Mt.'s "they that are strong" he gives us "they that are in health," viii. 27, the allusion to a characteristic phenomenon of insanity, and viii. 43, where Mk. relates (v. 26) that the woman with the issue of blood "had suffered many things at the hands of many physicians, and had spent all that she had and was no better but rather became

[1] ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν ταύτην, θεωρήσαντες τὰ γενόμενα . . . ὁρῶσαι ταῦτα.

[2] Dr. Abbott (*Corrections of Mark*) mentions among others Mk. ii. 4, 9, 11 (κράβαττος); x. 25 (ῥαφίς); xiv. 65 (ῥάπισμα)—all of which are condemned by Phrynichus the grammarian.

[3] The ancient medical writers, besides Hippocrates, who lived in the fifth century B.C., are Celsus, Dioscorides, Aretæus, all three contemporary, or nearly so, with S. Luke, and Galen, a century later. It has been suggested that S. Luke's Preface is an imitation of the Preface to the *Materia Medica* of Dioscorides. See Naylor in *Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1909.

[4] This is no doubt intended to prepare the way for xxiii. 35—"He saved [healed] others; let him save himself."

worse," and Lk. is content to say that "she could not be healed of any." So he omits (xvii. 1, 2) the metaphor of amputation in Mt. v. 29, 30 (= xviii. 6–9). It may also be noted that Lk. alone records the healing of the ear of the servant in the garden (xxii. 51).[1] Among his actual medical terms are "holden with a great fever" (iv. 38), "full of leprosy" (v. 12), "a man that was palsied" (v. 18), "moisture" (viii. 6), "foaming" (ix. 39), "half dead" (x. 30), "dropsical" (xiv. 2), "surfeiting" (xxi. 34), "tormented" (ii. 48, xvi. 24, 25), and several of the words connected with the subject of pregnancy and childbirth.[2]

To pass from these details to effects somewhat broader, it may be noted that he is fond of teaching by contrast or cumulative effect. He has in chapter xv. three "Lost" parables in succession, the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, the Lost Son. Of this group two members and the arrangement are his own. He has in ix. 57–62 three aspirants for discipleship as against S. Matthew's two. He alone points the contrast between the two robbers on the cross, and he alone of the Synoptists between Martha and Mary. His parables include the contrasts between Dives and Lazarus, the Pharisee and the Publican, the two debtors, the priest and the Levite and the Samaritan, the Judge and the Widow, the one and the nine lepers, and the Prodigal and his brother.

These examples are quite obvious. But it is easy to overdo the search for indications of design. Most readers will feel that little of the elaborate analysis constructed by Westcott (*Introd. to Study of the Gospels*, pp. 393 f., 480 f., 484 f.) was really present to the mind of the Evangelist. And it is not easy to feel certain of the significance of such a fact as that noted by von Soden

[1] If it be thought that a miracle recorded by only one Evangelist is probably not genuine, it is not difficult to explain this (as Dr. Abbott suggests in *Encycl. Bibl.*, ii, p. 1793) by supposing that an original tradition "let it [i.e. the sword] be restored to its place" was misunderstood by S. Luke or his authority. Harnack (*Luke the Physician*, p. 187) is quite sure that S. Luke has invented the story "in championship of Our Lord the Physician. It would have been inexcusable if He had not exerted His miraculous powers of healing on this occasion."

[2] It is interesting to observe that in Acts xxviii. 10, immediately after the relation of the curing of the chief's father and other sick persons, S. Luke adds that "they honoured *us* with many honours." It seems probable that the healings were an instance of a co-operation that ought to be more common than it is. Sir W. M. Ramsay notes (*Luke the Physician*, p. 16) that the words employed in xxviii. 8 and 9 are *ἰάσατο* ("he healed") and *ἐθεραπεύοντο* ("were medically treated").

(*History of Early Christian Literature*, p. 175): "We find among them [his additions] no fewer than three passages concerned with Samaritans (ix. 51–56, x. 25–37, xvii. 11–19), three with sinners (vii. 36–50, xvii. 9–14, xix. 1–10), and three with women (vii. 36–50, viii. 1–3, x. 38–42)."

At any rate, we are on surer foundation when we say that he is a master of Tragic Irony, the making of a character in a drama say something which really tells, and is recognized by those who know the whole story as telling, in the opposite direction from that in which the speaker supposes. S. Luke does not as a rule stop to explain his allusions, but he surely appreciates the fact that a decree of Cæsar was the occasion which led to the birth of the King of kings at Bethlehem. Some of his instances, the supreme case of the kiss of Judas,[1] the "ninety and nine just persons," the fact that it was the Sadducees who brought up the problem of the resurrection and a maidservant who put one of the crucial questions in the courtyard, the gibe that He saved others and if He is indeed the Christ of God, the elect, He may now save Himself—all these are part of the general tradition of the Gospels. But other examples are his own. The "is not this the son of Joseph?" (iv. 22) and the "two swords" of xxii. 38 are cases in point. Another notable case is the Woman in vii. 36 ff. In this passage the fact that the woman was a sinner and the whole inserted story of the two debtors and the lesson drawn therefrom is peculiar to S. Luke. The irony of the situation between the woman and the Pharisee, and the "If this man had been a prophet he would have known," is truly Sophoclean. So, or rather perhaps Socratic, is the way in which the Pharisee himself answers the question, "Which of them will love him more?" with the answer, "He to whom he forgave more."[2] The parable

[1] S. Luke does point the irony of the kiss of Judas (xxii. 48).

[2] This answer, it may be noted in passing, clears up a frequent misunderstanding of the meaning of the story. "Because she loved much" does not mean "She was forgiven because she loved." That is the wrong order. There is a famous passage in Du Maurier's *Trilby* which contains an effective but mistaken use of *quia multum amavit*. The truth is, God begins. And the meaning of the whole passage, as vii. 47 f. and the inserted story of the two debtors shews quite plainly, is, "You can see how much she must have been forgiven, because she loves so much." The Vulgate reads *quoniam dilexit multum*, which is nearer to the real meaning of the Greek. A friend informs me that *quia multum amavit* was invented by Thackeray and copied from him by Du Maurier.

of the Rich Fool (xii. 16 f.) is another case of Tragic Irony. So is the reconciliation of Pilate and Herod over Our Lord's condemnation. In xxiii. 25, S. Luke pens a sentence of which the pathos is almost insupportable: "And he released unto them him who for murder and sedition was cast into prison, *whom they had desired*, but Jesus he delivered to their will." And the story of Emmaus, where faith is born of the very ashes of despair, is full of irony, though of a tender and more healing kind.

As a painter of portraits S. Luke excels. His short pen-pictures of Zacharias, the Virgin Mother, Martha and Mary,[1] Zacchæus, and the repentant robber are masterly, and though it is S. Mark whose Gospel is believed to contain the recollections of S. Peter, and S. Matthew who is commonly said to have had access to a special Petrine source,[2] yet it is from S. Luke that we get those three penetrating touches that have done so much to make Peter seem to us the most human of the apostles. They are v. 8—"Depart from Me," with its sequel, "Fear not"; xxii. 31, 32—"Simon, Simon, behold Satan desired to have you that he might sift you as wheat; but I prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren"; and xxii. 61—"The Lord turned and looked upon Peter." Finally, to his description of the "woes" upon the scribes or lawyers which he has in common with S. Matthew, S. Luke adds the dramatic touch, "Ye take away the key of knowledge" (xi. 52).

In the case of S. Luke's parables, we do not, of course, know how far he inherited the actual words in which he tells them. But anyhow he gave them a place in his Gospel, and it is possible that he was the first to write down some of them in Greek.[3] The

[1] It is interesting to see that the passage about married and unmarried women in 1 Cor. vii. 32–35 presents a number of parallels to the description of Martha and Mary in Lk. x. 38–42. Readers of Greek will note that no less than three of S. Luke's words, παρακαθεσθεῖσα (39), περιεσπᾶτο (40), and μεριμνᾷς (41) have their counterpart in S. Paul's language (εὐπάρεδρον τῷ κυρίῳ—ἀπερισπάστως—μεριμνᾷ).

[2] The incidents of Mt. xiv. 28–31, xvi. 17–19, xvii. 24–27 occur only in that Gospel.

[3] Dr. Stanton notes that the parable of the Good Samaritan (x. 25–37) is specially marked by Lukan characteristics. He observes: "The literary style of the whole piece is admirable. Among other excellences note the three participial clauses in *v.* 30, and their arrangement, the first two being joined by a conjunction and placed before the verb, and the third, of which the action coincides with that of the verb, placed after it. Moreover, as this last clause describes the condition in which the wounded traveller was left, it forms an impressive ending to the sentence. The combination of

parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, which is the summing-up, in an historical sense, of the whole Evangel, he shares with S. Matthew and S. Mark, but he alone gives us those spiritual summaries of it which we know as the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son.

There are two schools of interpretation of the parables. The one, following such whole-hearted allegorizers as Origen and Augustine, not to speak of the minute distortions of the Gnostic writers, finds a meaning in every detail, and is often fantastic and impossible. It is incredible, for example, that the " three loaves " of Lk. xi. 5 stand for the doctrine of the Trinity, and only one degree less unlikely that the " two pence " of the Good Samaritan stand specifically for the two Sacraments of the Gospel. A number of examples are quoted in Trench, *On the Parables*. The other school finds one principal idea in each parable and neglects the details. This canon seems on the whole safer than the other, but it is sometimes pressed too severely. Thus, in Dives and Lazarus, although the main lesson is one of mercy, it is probable that the parable is intended incidentally to teach that there is progress after death. On the other hand again, it does not sanction " Abraham's bosom " as the last word in the definition of the heavenly state.[1]

One of the Lukan parables which is often misunderstood is that of the unrighteous Steward (xvi. 1 f.). Of the very numerous expositions of the parable the most interesting is that of F. D. Maurice. He supposes that the steward is the Jew, who is tempted by the growing popularity of his religion with curious Gentile inquirers to relax his moral and spiritual standards, and to ask fourscore or fifty instead of the divine requirement of a hundred. Other familiar difficulties are largely solved in the

variety with repetition in *v.* 32, as compared with *v.* 31, should also be noted; and again, the expressive compound words—*ἀντιπαρῆλθεν*—*ἐπιχέων*—*ἐκβαλών*—*προσδαπανήσῃς*—*ἐπανέρχεσθαι*" (*Gospels*, etc., ii, p. 300).

[1] This is not meant to discourage detailed application of the parables to modern conditions, which is often most profitable. Trench is a mine of information as to how they have been or may be interpreted. It is often thought that Mt.'s explanation of the Tares (xiii. 36–43) is his own and not the Lord's. The same objections do not seem to lie against the explanation of the Sower, which is found in all three Gospels (Lk. viii. 10 f.). It may be noted that the Jews were weak in the pictorial and plastic arts, and their word-pictures, e.g. the visions of Ezekiel and others in the Old Testament, and the Apocalypse, often contain a great number of individually significant touches which are very hard to combine into a consistent whole.

Revised version. The "lord" in *v.* 8 is not Jesus, but the master in the parable. The correct version of *v.* 9 is "Make to yourselves friends *by means* of the mammon of unrighteousness,[1] that when *it fails* they may receive you into eternal habitations." The whole argument is, first, that the instinct to make friends is right, and then, that business efficiency produces business success, whereas the children of the light do not take enough trouble over their religion.[2]

It may be said that S. Luke appreciates, not indeed to the full, but nevertheless as few other writers would, what has been called the balance of Our Lord's teaching. "These ought ye to have done and not to leave the other undone" (xi. 42). "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's" (xx. 25). It is easy to be extravagant in one direction. S. Luke, like Christianity itself, is extravagant in both directions. He has, as we have seen, a bias in favour of asceticism. The beatitudes in his Gospel are not for those who hunger and thirst after righteousness, and for the poor in spirit, but for the actual poor and those who are really hungry and really weep;[3] his version of "him that loveth father or mother more than me" is "him that hateth not his father or his mother"; and so forth. But on the other hand he is perhaps the most practical of the Evangelists.[4] He makes it clear that Our Lord, in the words of

[1] "The mammon of unrighteousness" comes from Enoch.

[2] A simpler, probably too simple, explanation is that the Steward had previously overcharged the debtors. Some critics think that this parable, and the Unjust Judge, and the Importunate Friend are not genuine. See Abbott in *Encycl. Bibl.*, ii, p. 1792. Schmiedel (*ibid.*, ii, p. 1864) finds in it "two Ebionitic hands" and a transforming revision by the Evangelist! Mr. A. G. Little (*Studies in English Franciscan History*, p. 147 f.) quotes some curious examples of the *argumentum a mundo* from the preaching of the Friars. Thus the fourteenth-century *Fasciculus Morum* contains the following: "We have an example in the poor little spinster who takes wool to spin, but often compelled by necessity, because she has not enough to live on, she sells some of the wool, and when she has to take the spun wool back, she moistens it, so that the weight may not be wanting. Now *we* ought to do like that. When at the suggestion of the flesh or the devil we rob God, not of wool or linen, but of our soul, created in His image; if we wish to restore it to Him with its full weight, we must moisten it well with penance and tears of contrition."

[3] See, however, p. 116, n. 2.

[4] Few questions have been more discussed than that of the *practicable* (or impracticable) nature of such sayings as "unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other" (Lk. vi. 29). But there can be no doubt that they are strictly, even violently, *practical*, i.e. they demand positive action. I cannot feel myself that the true meaning of "Christian non-resistance" has yet been discovered. Certainly, as Canon Peter Green points out (*The War and the Kingdom of God*, p. 87), it is impossible to expect that nations and other partly Christian societies shall practise it, until Christian

Dr. Du Bose, "took definite part with the West against the East in making the distinctive note of life not *apatheia* but *energeia*" (*The Gospel in the Gospels*, p. 19). It is not possible to serve God and mammon, but on the other hand it is possible (xvi. 9) to make friends "by means of the mammon of unrighteousness." The conclusion of the Good Samaritan, "Go and do thou likewise," is severely practical. In his record of the saying about taking up the Cross (ix. 23), and in his version of the Lord's Prayer (xi. 3), S. Luke adds the words "day by day." He is opposed to sentimentality. In three cases he alone records Our Lord's rebuke of it. In xi. 27 he tells how a woman lifted up her voice and said, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee and the breasts that thou hast sucked." But He said, "Rather, blessed are they who hear the word of God and keep it." In xiv. 15 a similar remark, "Blessed is he who shall eat bread in the kingdom of heaven," that is (with clasped hands and upturned eyes): "What a happy thing it will be when we all meet in heaven" is followed by—"But He said unto him, A certain man made a great feast, and bade many. And they made excuse." And the well-meant weepings of the daughters of Jerusalem are met by—"Weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children" (xxiii. 28). The allegiance must be whole-hearted, and the kingdom is other-worldly, but men may not lightly pledge their lives in a moment of enthusiasm. The three aspirants (ix. 57–62) are bidden to examine their prospect of perseverance, the man who would build a tower, and the king who would go to war with his adversary, are counselled to sit down and count the cost (xiv. 28–33), and one who would like to listen to an abstract disquisition on the fewness of those who shall be saved is told to strive that he may enter through the narrow gate (xiii. 23). The whole of the eleventh chapter [1] of the Gospel is one long reminder of the necessity of incessant prayer and incessant effort,

individuals have discovered and exhibited its meaning on a far larger scale than has hitherto been done. At present the point that we have reached seems to be this: a nation or society is justified in taking measures for the restraint of anti-social conduct, but in the Christian who calls such restraint into operation there must be no personal vindictiveness. As far as he is himself concerned, he ought to be willing to "take joyfully the spoiling of his goods," or even to suffer in person. See the excellent remarks of Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. 185.

[1] See especially verse 8, the strong word *ἀναιδίαν*, "audacious desire to get" (Moulton and Milligan, s.v. *ἀναίδεια*). So the poet speaks:

and the kingdom of heaven (xv. 16) is something that has to be taken by force.

Once more, our Evangelist can depict a situation. He tells us how the kingdoms of the world were brought before the imagination of Our Lord by the tempter "in a moment of time." It is he, as we have seen, who tells how the captive Master turned and looked after the disciple who had purchased his liberty at the price of his loyalty (xxii. 61). It is he who ends the story of the rebuking of James and John, when they desired to call down fire from heaven on the inhospitable Samaritans, with the simple, pregnant sentence, "And they went to another village" (ix. 56). One of the most dramatic situations in this Gospel is the Trial before Herod, which occurs only in S. Luke. The reader has been prepared for it by ix. 9 and xiii. 32. The central incident of the Trial, usually described as the mocking before Herod, is not easy to understand. It is one of three mockings in the Gospels (two in S. Luke), the other two being those by the Temple servants and by the soldiers of Pilate. Three is a curiously large number. But it perhaps can be explained. In April 1909, an article, "Christ before Herod," was published in the *Journal of Theological Studies* by Dr. Verrall, the distinguished classical scholar, who brought his accustomed ingenuity to bear upon the problem. His argument, as might be expected by those who know his Horatian and Euripidean Studies, is too elaborate to reproduce in anything like detail, but the gist of it is this: Herod was not unfavourably disposed, and even when the Magician would not perform any of his feats, he nevertheless made him a present of a cast-off robe. This robe was subsequently preserved by the agents of the Crucifixion, because a garment which had come from a king's wardrobe would fetch a considerable sum. The meaning of xxiii. 11 ("Herod with his soldiers set him at nought, and mocked him") is this: Herod

> "Fervent love,
> And lively hope, with violence assail
> The kingdom of the heavens, and overcome
> The Will of the Most High; not in such sort
> As man prevails o'er man, but conquers it
> Because 'tis willing to be conquer'd, still,
> Though conquer'd, by its mercy conquering."
>
> DANTE, *Paradiso* 20, Cary's trans.

had been consulted by Pilate as to whether the prisoner was politically dangerous. Herod was satisfied that He was not. The King "with his soldiers," i.e. not with the help of the few men-at-arms whom he would have with him at Jerusalem, but "with his forces," that is, relying on the security of his general position, made light of the supposed danger, and reassured the governor. Whether Verrall's reconstruction of the scene is correct or not, the situation of the expectant monarch and the silent Christ is one which demands, and has obtained, a great artist to depict it.[1]

But the supremely dramatic passage in the Gospel is the picture in the last chapter of the two enthusiasts who, chilled and disappointed by a signal failure, were taking a country walk together on Sunday afternoon. They were talking of the apparent impotence of good. The chivalrous effort of a great champion has been met by the lethargy of some and the bitter opposition of others. Once more a human sacrifice has been laid upon the altar of the world; one more heroic life has poured itself into the great attempt to lift the level of humanity. But everything has come to nothing. "All he was is overborne." As usual, it ends in the martyrdom of the hero and the failure of the cause. "We must go back, and begin again at the beginning. What weary work it is!"

And, as they talked, Jesus Himself drew near. The supernatural is there, the possibility of victory, even the victory itself, but it is not recognized at first. "What manner of communications are these that ye have one with another, as ye walk and are sad?" It is the method of Christ to make men formulate their troubles. Not till the difficulty has been faced and made articulate, not till the reformer has gone to the root of the matter and called things by their right names, is he ready for Christ. The pitiful inadequacy of merely political remedies, the need to change the characters of men, the fact of sin, mankind's necessity, is the Great Physician's opportunity. It is the humble and meek who are exalted.

They explain the failure of their hopes. They had at one

[1] Dr. Wright (*S. Luke's Gospel*, p. 203), Canon Streeter (*Oxford Studies*, p. 229), and Dr. T. R. Glover connect the estrangement of Herod and Pilate with the incident of Lk. xiii. 1–5.

time expected that the religion of Jesus would have redeemed Israel. But now it is dead. They see and realize quite well the point of failure. If only it had not died, it would have been just the thing that was wanted. If only some spirit could descend upon them from above, and purge away the cruelty and selfishness and laziness which are the real obstacles to reform!

"But are you sure that it is dead?" Well, it was true that certain women of their company had found the tomb empty and had brought back word of an angelic message. But those who had gone to verify the rumour had not seen Him. "O foolish ones and slow of heart to believe." And beginning at Moses and all the Prophets, He expounded unto them the things concerning Himself. He touches the Scriptures with such a kindred touch, and with such mastery, He speaks of sacrifice and resurrection with such experience and such authority, that their hearts burn within them. What manner of man is this?

"They drew nigh unto the village whither they went, and He made as though He would go further." He is willing, it seems, to carry them on with Him to further truth, but they have reached their limit. And He is content to wait. He has still many things to say to them, but they cannot bear them now.

But He has, even now—and they feel that He has—a secret to impart—something which they will be able to understand with growing clearness, and use with growing power in after years. "Abide with us, for it is towards evening, and the day is far spent. Come into our home and share our life. Sit down with us to meat. Work out in practice the marvellous things of which we hear. As by thy special grace preventing us thou dost put into our minds good desires, so by thy continual help we may bring the same to good effect. Translate the ideal into flesh and blood. How do these magnificent conceptions, Incarnation, Atonement, Resurrection, make men better? How are our problems of home and work and life interpreted by the gift of which thou speakest?"

"Abide with us." And He went in to tarry with them. And as He sat at meat with them, He took bread and blessed and brake and gave to them. And their eyes were opened and they knew Him. The common meal of bread and wine is trans-

figured into the Supper of the Lord. When brothers are assembled in repentance and full consciousness that all their brotherhood depends upon the Fatherhood of God and the Sonship of His Christ, their fellowship is made divine. The natural is met and strengthened and uplifted by the supernatural. The simplest thing of daily life is not already but can be made religion by the touch of God.

CHAPTER XV

S. LUKE THE DEMOCRAT

It must be confessed that the title of this chapter is very loose. We do not know what S. Luke's political opinions were. We are not sure that he had any. We cannot, for example, draw any general conclusion from the fact that both the Baptist and Our Lord are described by him as being in opposition to King Herod. Still less from the fact that, in his version of what is most likely the same parable, the "pounds," unlike S. Matthew's "talents," are equally distributed. It is probable that he was disposed to accept without question or complaint the Imperial system.[1] At any rate such political opinions as he had were no doubt largely the result of his religion. He might have exclaimed, with a famous modern Christian, "All my radicalism I sucked in from the breasts of the Gospel."

And yet it was difficult for a first-century Christian not to have opinions which touched politics very nearly. The Christians of the first few centuries were deficient in the civic virtues, but that was because they were disfranchised by persecution, and because they despaired of the existing state of things. A modern thorough-going Syndicalist regards with indifference the questions at issue between the two old political parties, but he has his own views about what he would like to do with both of them.

It is not quite without reason that the Christians of the first century have been compared to the Syndicalists of the twentieth. There are obvious differences, but there is an undeniable

[1] This is the more probable because the Gospel tends to exonerate Pilate from the guilt of the Crucifixion (xxiii. 4, 7, 14–20), and it is well known that Acts exhibits the Roman authorities as being fairly tolerant to S. Paul. The fact that in several cases S. Luke records words of rebuke as addressed to "the multitudes" (iii. 7, xi. 29–36, xii. 54), whereas S. Matthew addresses them to the Scribes or Pharisees, from which Dr. Wright infers that he had a Greek dislike of the vulgar rabble (*Synopsis*, ed. 2, p. xxiv.), can hardly be counted against the preponderant weight of evidence on the other side.

comparison. The early Christians lived in eager expectation of a coming day which would repair all abuses and inaugurate a happier *régime*. The destruction of the existing world was a small price to pay for the advent of the next.

S. Luke's own version of this hope was that the new *régime* had been inaugurated already. His position may be compared to that of a Syndicalist after the Act of Revolution has taken place, when all that remains is the task of converting everybody in the world to accept the system and co-operate with it. The Day of Pentecost, which was an earnest of the final Parousia, had fully come, and the Church had only to be built up and multiplied.

S. Luke's conception of the Church was that it was a body in which the poor and needy for the first time had a fair and equal chance. In the Homeric battles, of which he doubtless knew something, the real fighting was all done by the well-armed heroes, and the multitude existed and fought only as what would nowadays be called "cannon-fodder." This was, in fact, the general valuation of the ancient world. Even the much-lauded Athenian democracy was only democratic within very definite limits. The chairs of the discussing, legislating citizens were borne upon the necks of slaves. And the favourite philosophies of the age in which the Gospel came were aristocratic. They were philosophies of the well-to-do; Stoics like Seneca reclined on couches which were made by sweated labour, reflecting on prudence, justice, temperance, and fortitude, while their severe pleasures were ministered to them by certain of those less fortunate beings who had been designed by nature for the servile state.

It is not to be supposed that S. Luke, any more than S. Paul, proposed to abolish slavery. A general revolt would clearly have done more harm than good, and S. Luke probably did not think that it mattered much whether you were a slave or not.[1] He had quite possibly been a slave himself, and if so, since his vocation was certainly to be a missionary and Church writer, he was glad that he was one no longer, but if he had been a domestic

[1] See 1 Cor. 7, 21. "Were you a slave when you became a Christian? Care not for it, but if you get the opportunity of becoming free, use it rather." The meaning of χρῆσαι is disputed, but it most likely signifies "use the opportunity." But the Epistle to Philemon is the real key to S. Paul's view of slavery.

slave, the physician-secretary of some great household, he would no doubt have made it his aim to serve his heathen master faithfully.

The thing of which he was profoundly convinced was the general dignity of man as man, a dignity so high and wonderful that beside it the ordinary distinctions that men make between themselves are of no account. The coming of Christ in human flesh had conferred upon humanity at large a new status, a status which before had not been dreamed of. The change was heartily disliked by those who were already comfortably established; it bewildered and excited, sometimes unduly, many of those for whom it was primarily intended. S. Luke was not a great theologian, like S. Paul, and it is not to be supposed that he had worked out all the implications of belief in the Divinity of Christ. But inasmuch as he was a disciple of S. Paul, and inasmuch as his own Christianity consisted of Churchmanship, the supposition is legitimate, and indeed it is abundantly justified by the facts of his Gospel, that he believed all human souls to be precious in God's sight.

A passage from Professor Gilbert Murray's *Four Stages of Greek Religion* is instructive at this point. He says: "It always appears to me that, historically speaking, the character of Christianity in these early centuries is to be sought not so much in the doctrines which it professed, nearly all of which had their roots and their close parallels in older Hellenic or Hebrew thought, but in the organization on which it rested. For my own part, when I try to understand Christianity as a mass of doctrines, Gnostic, Trinitarian, Monophysite, Arian, and the rest, I get no further. When I try to realize it as a sort of semi-secret society for mutual help, with a mystical religious basis, resting first on the proletariats of Antioch and the great commercial and manufacturing towns of the Levant, then spreading by instinctive sympathy to similar classes in Rome and the West, and rising in influence, like certain other mystical cults, by the special appeal it made to women, the various historical puzzles begin to fall into place. Among other things this explains the strange subterranean power by which the Emperor Diocletian was baffled, and to which the pretender Constantine had to capitulate; it

explains its humanity, its intense feeling of brotherhood within its own bounds, its incessant care for the poor, and also its comparative indifference to the virtues which are specially incumbent on a governing class, such as statesmanship, moderation, truthfulness, active courage, learning, culture, and public spirit. Of course such indifference was only comparative. After the time of Constantine the governing classes come into the fold, bringing with them their normal qualities, and thereafter it is Paganism, not Christianity, that must uphold the flag of a desperate fidelity in the face of a hostile world—a task to which naturally enough Paganism was not equal. . . . The minds that are now tender, timid, and reverent in their orthodoxy would probably in the third or fourth century have sided with the old gods; those of more daring and puritan temper with the Christians" (pp. 179–180).

It is not necessary to agree entirely with every word of this. But it is largely true, and it forms a valuable commentary on the Gospel of S. Luke. If we may leave aside consideration of the accuracy of all the Professor's judgments, it appears that the chief danger of so viewing Christianity, even if it be so viewed with friendly eyes, is that you may tend to substitute the Church for Christ. S. Luke was preserved from this danger because he was an Evangelist, and because he was a disciple of S. Paul, a teacher who would effectually prevent him from neglecting the personality of Christ. Professor Murray, surveying Church history with a severe regard, resolves Christianity into membership of a community. Professor Royce, in *The Problem of Christianity*, surveying it with greater sympathy, resolves Christianity into "devotion to the beloved community." Both appear to eliminate or at all events to obscure Christ. No religion which does that can claim to be the Christian religion. S. Luke is saved from doing it by the nature of his experience, by the fact that he wrote the Gospel as well as the Acts, and by the fact that S. Paul, in Ephesians and elsewhere, deals first with the doctrine of Christ's Person, and only then and thence draws out his doctrine of Christ's Church.

S. Luke's doctrine of the Incarnation, in so far as it is right to say that he had a formal doctrine, is a social doctrine. His

general theological position was that Christ had enriched the stream of human life with a divine infusion, and his general practical conclusion was that everybody, the poor man as well as the rich man, the woman as well as the man, was an interesting and important person.

This was not a mechanical judgment. He did not suggest that the poor man would be saved because he was poor. In the parable of Dives and Lazarus, in which the condition after death does happen to be a simple reversal of the previous parts of the two men, it yet also happens that the fortunate state of Lazarus is actually defined as consisting of the society of the wealthy Abraham. S. Luke, who records a quarrel even in the Upper Room, knows well that the multitude are not always discerning, and that poor men are not led by unfailing instinct through the narrow gate. He tells how Our Lord took a little child and set him in the midst. The child was any child, and the symbolic meaning was that the ordinary childlike character is the kind of character to have. Yes, but it must be used. It is vital to use what God has given. He records how Our Lord said, "Some one touched me, for I knew that virtue was gone out from me." There was in Him the general will to heal, without distinction, but something further was required. It is not quite clear what happened immediately after the woman's touch, but there is surely some additional meaning, perhaps a permanent cure, in "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace" (viii. 43–48). Again, he describes how the sick man was borne of four into the presence of the Healer. But that is not all that happened. "*Seeing their faith*, he said, Man, thy sins are forgiven thee" (v. 20). In like manner all through the Christian centuries wistful souls have been borne of four Evangelists into the presence of the Healer, but S. Luke for his part will not disguise from us that mechanical juxtapositions do not save souls. It will not do to begin to say, "We have Abraham to our father": it will not even do to claim, "We have eaten and drunk in Thy presence, and Thou hast taught in our streets. For I will say to them, I know not whence ye are" (iii. 8, xiii. 26).

And if men are not saved by merely having seen the life and handled it, still less are they saved by merely having seen and

handled something else. The man who came and said, "Master, speak to my brother that he divide the inheritance with me," is a type of those who think that society can be redeemed by a mechanical redistribution of goods, but the answer, "Who made me a judge or a divider over you. . . . Take heed and keep yourselves from covetousness. . . . A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things that he possesses," is a reminder that salvation is a spiritual thing (xii. 13 f.).

The fact is that S. Luke's democracy was of the Christian sort. And Christian democracy has always comprehended some elements which are commonly thought of as belonging to other systems. There is in it, for example, an element of autocracy. S. Luke had quite enough of what Matthew Arnold called Hebraism to know that there is an irresistible, unquestionable will of God. Joseph and Mary accept the decree of Cæsar that they must go to Bethlehem and register their names. So Mary must accept the sword that will go through her heart. The friends of the eighteen victims of the falling tower must realize that God is wise and just and irresistible. All persons must accept the Ten Commandments, because that is the Will of God, against which there is no appeal. The rich young man must accept his difficult orders because that is his vocation, from which there is no escape but disobedience. There is an element of legalism in the Gospel.

There is also room in S. Luke's system for aristocracy. It is not impossible that he himself was ranked among the prophets, and anyhow, although it is he who records the saying, "Rejoice not that the spirits are subject unto you, but rejoice that your names are written in the Book of Life," yet he knew that some had special gifts. "When thou art converted," says the Lord to Peter in his Gospel, "strengthen thy brethren." His picture of Mary, unique in privilege, blessed among women, the high place which he assigns to the Forerunner, the greatest among those born of women, the contrast between the twelve and "the rest," who see and perceive not, who hear and understand not—these things are proofs that he recognized the fatal weakness of mere democracy, the inexorable fact that the majority are liable at any given time to be mistaken. They need the help of such

as would in an ordinary connexion be called leaders—not, in Carlyle's scornful language, "the few wise to take command of the innumerable foolish," but those who in this context may be called saints and prophets.

All this is but to say that he recognized that humanity must be fortified by sense of duty, and taught by the inspiration of its most inspired individuals. He knew that the only thing which could kindle the passion for righteousness, which Arnold calls Hebraic, was the conception of a dominant, overhanging Divine Will, by which all projects must be measured, without which all strength is useless, with which the little ones go forth as mighty. It was this conception which in the Acts inspired unlearned men to stand out before the grand Council of their nation and say, "We must obey God rather than men," and later, in their own Council at Jerusalem, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us. . . ." He knew that if you refused to avail yourself of the help and example of those whom God had set before your eyes, a Mary or a Paul, you were rejecting means of grace.

It is easy to shew that S. Luke had a special sympathy with the poor man. But that was because of the special circumstances of the poor man, because nobody else had so far shewn him any sympathy at all. His real sympathy was with every man. It may be that he a little exaggerates the ascetic, world-renouncing side of Our Lord's teaching. Professor Burkitt has suggested that if the Acts had been written by the author of the First Gospel instead of the author of the Third, we should have heard less about their community of property, and more about their community of customs and morals.[1] It may be so, though as a matter of fact we do not hear very much about their community of property, and one of the things we do hear is that it was not compulsory. But at any rate, in spite of the ordinary superficial exegesis of Dives and Lazarus, it is quite impossible to assert that S. Luke's conception of heaven was a place where all the rich would be poor and all the poor would be rich.

He did seriously believe that wealth was a terribly dangerous thing. He suspected it. And he a little bit suspects position.

[1] *Gospel History*, p. 214.

He alone mentions that the man with great possessions was a "ruler" (xviii. 18). He probably recorded with discerning appreciation the fact that it was first the priest and then the Levite who passed the wounded traveller. So, earlier in his narrative, he had not failed to see the contrast between Zacharias the unbelieving priest and Mary the believing maiden. He tended, as the Old Testament, and especially the Psalms, had tended, to find among the poor and needy (not, be it noted, the victims of the grinding poverty which has been produced by modern civilization, but among the decent poor), his best examples. And this agrees with the known fact, which has of late years been so strenuously restated and so richly illustrated by Deissmann, that Christianity first became known and made its way among the common people.[1]

Consider again from this point of view his account of Our Lord's life. Born in a stable, because the public-house was occupied, in after years a manual labourer, and then a vagrant, with not where to lay His head, suspected by His brethren on the ground that He was an upstart, and by the clergy because He had no University degree, accused of all the offences of which the poor man always is accused—conceit, unworthy motives, lack of authority, trespassing on rights of property, and general impossibility—He is arrested, tried by summary process, bandied from Pilate to Herod, and back again to Pilate, finding the kind of justice that the poor man so often finds, and in the end He dies by Crucifixion on the gallows.

The greater part of Our Lord's life was lived among the poor, and therefore it is not wonderful that much of His teaching is

[1] "Even when Christianity had risen from the workshop and the cottage to the palace and the schools of learning, it did not desert the workshop and the cottage. The living roots of Christianity remained in their native soil—the lower ranks of society—and regularly in the cycle of the years, when autumn had gathered the topmost leaves and the dry boughs had snapped beneath the storms of winter, the sap rose upward and woke the buds from slumber, with promise of blossom and rich days of fruitage. Jesus the carpenter and Paul the weaver of tent cloth mark the beginnings, and again at the most momentous crisis in the history of later Christianity there comes another *homo novus* in the person of Luther, the miner's son and peasant's grandson" (*Light from the Ancient East*, p. 404). Deissmann points out truly that we need a history of Christianity—or, as Dr. T. R. Glover puts it in his *Nature and Purpose of a Christian Society*, "a history of Christian character," written from this point of view. Something of the kind was attempted in Brace's *Gesta Christi*, and more recently, on a small scale, but with more knowledge and perspective, by Mr. J. K. Mozley in *The Achievements of Christianity*.

drawn from their example. His parables are about the patching of old clothes and the baking or the borrowing of a loaf of bread. The culminating-point of His description of His work to S. John Baptist is: "the poor have the Gospel preached unto them."[1] And S. Luke has caught this tone. The quotation from Isaiah, on which his sermon at Nazareth in iv. 16 is based, is about the gospel of release which is to be proclaimed to the poor and the oppressed. The Magnificat is the most revolutionary of hymns. The poor widow, the publican, and the prostitute are among the most typical of Lukan characters. The Prodigal Son, the Good Samaritan, and many others are parables of mercy.

This comes, as I say, from his belief in the Incarnation. "He shall be great and shall be called Son of the Most Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of David, his father, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his Kingdom there shall be no end. . . . How shall this be? . . . Holy Breath shall come upon thee, and power of the Most Highest shall overshadow thee: wherefore also that which is born of thee shall be called holy, the Son of God." It is amazing that after this profound exordium he should have been content, as the apocryphal Gospels were obviously not content, to tell a simple, round, unvarnished tale of human action and emotion. The Gospel of S. John, following upon the Prologue, is almost as extraordinary. But the very idea of compiling at all such Gospels as we have is the real miracle, and I have tried to shew that one of the leading evidences of the general truthfulness of the Gospels is the primitive, non-anachronistic character of their language and their subject-matter. The faith of all who would be Christian democrats is founded on the fact that the Son of Mary is the Son of God.

[1] In view of the fact that *καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται* is omitted by *k* and *Syr. Sin.* in Mt. xi. 5, Prof. Burkitt suggests that "there can be little doubt that the clause is S. Luke's own insertion, and that it gives his quite correct interpretation of the inner meaning of the rest of this saying of Our Lord" (*Journ. Theol. Stud.*, Apr. 1907, p. 458. Cp. *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, ii, p. 239).

CHAPTER XVI

S. LUKE THE UNIVERSALIST

It is not easy, as we have seen already, to say to what extent S. Luke had worked out his doctrine of what has since come to be called the Incarnation. It is certain, however, that he held the conviction that in Christ there had come divine deliverance for the human race. And what he meant is summed up, for him perhaps especially among the Evangelists, by the title of Our Lord's own choice, the Son of Man.

We saw in an earlier chapter that this title, though of apocalyptic origin, yet may fairly be said to indicate the human, even if not specifically the plain, everyday character of Our Lord's life among men. It is time now to examine something of its theological significance.

One of the most interesting points about the Old Testament Messianic expectation is the way in which sometimes the Kingdom is anticipated without any mention of a King, and at other times the conceptions of Messiah and the Messianic Kingdom are intermingled. Thus in Second Isaiah the Figure of the Servant (it is not necessary to consider here whether the Servant is Messianic in the strict sense) is such that it is not easy to say when He is an individual and when the nation or some part of it.[1] The difficulty is even greater when in the later books the term "Son of Man" is used. In Dan. vii. 13 the "one like unto a son of Man" is hardly personal at all. In the *Similitudes* of Enoch "the Son of Man" has become personal and also clearly superhuman, but He is still to some extent a representative figure. It is not, therefore, surprising that Our Lord, wishing to use, and also to enlarge, the idea of Messiah, should have chosen this

[1] Cp. Ps. lxxxix. 19–44 (David and Israel), and also the way in which the "I" of the Psalmist constantly stands for the nation and is by modern readers interpreted as meaning the Church or even humanity.

more than national, this broadly human term, which some have actually desired to render "Man." He uses it [1] in the Gospels (some 80 times in all, and, as calculated by Dr. Driver, on some 40 different occasions [2]) in passages of two kinds. Sometimes it is a title of glory, as when He says (Lk. xxii. 69), "Henceforth the Son of Man shall be seated at the right hand of the power of God," and sometimes it is a title of humiliation, as in Lk. ix. 58 ("The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head").[3] This double use of the same term is closely parallel to the double sense in which it is used in the eighth psalm, or indeed in many of the famous passages in literature which contain moralizings on the nature of man. It would be easy to quote Sophocles, Shakespeare, and many more in support of the belief that humanity contains in a strangely earthen vessel some strange spark of the divine. But the point is that the broadly representative term "Son of Man" prepares the way, as the term "Messiah" could never have done, for the Christology which was to come. The Church would never have been satisfied with any but the highest explanation of Christ's Person, because Christians found in experience that He did mediate to them nothing less than God. "Messiah" would have broken, as in fact, where it was tried alone, it did break in their hands.[4]

[1] It is never used by the Evangelists in their own narratives, or elsewhere in the New Testament, except in S. Stephen's speech (Acts vii. 56), and in one or two cases of quotation from the Old Testament.

[2] Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, iv, p. 579*b*. No doubt this number must be reduced. The use of the term is perhaps only genuine in those passages which follow the confession of Peter.

[3] On this passage Dr. A. B. Bruce has made the interesting but not very convincing conjecture that it means "spiritually an alien, without a home in the religion of the time" (*With Open Face*, p. 218). Professor Lake is nearer the truth when he compares "the disciples," and, we may add, their Master, "in this respect" to "Catholic Modernists, who have been frequently disavowed by Catholic authority, yet have never accepted the situation" (*Earlier Epistles*, p. 15). In view of the fact that κλίνειν τὴν κεφαλήν occurs only in Lk. ix. 58 (= Mt. viii. 20), and Jn. xix. 30, Dr. Abbott remarks (*Encycl. Bibl.*, ii, p. 1778), "there is pathos and power in the thought that the one place on earth where the Son of man 'rested his head' was on the Cross, and the one moment was when he had accomplished the Father's will."

[4] See on this the reference given to Dr. E. F. Scott on p. 108. Cp. also: "It is difficult to expound the phrase 'Son of Man' without falling into the language of philosophy, which would be quite foreign to the lines of thought which belong to the Master. If we say that He claimed to embody the ideal Man or the idea of man, we use Platonic language. If we say that He stood as high priest for the human race, we fall into the way of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews and do not use the language of the

It was remarked just now that some would retranslate the term. The exact meaning of the original expression is no doubt a question for Aramaic scholars to decide.[1] But as far as the existing Greek Gospels are concerned, the general sense of "Man" would suit well enough a passage like—"The sabbath was made for man; therefore man [in the Gospels "the Son of Man"] is lord of the sabbath." But it does not satisfy such passages as the comparison with the Baptist ("John came neither eating nor drinking . . . the Son of Man came eating and drinking"), where it is clearly personal and almost as clearly a reference to the speaker Himself. Nor does it satisfy the majority of the other passages where the term occurs. But it is certainly the case that the term is in some sort inclusive. It means something like the Head and Representative of humanity, something like what Plato called the auto or ideal man; it means part at least of what Our Lord intended to convey by "Whosoever shall receive this little child in my name receiveth me"; it perhaps means what we may call, if it be possible to rescue the word from a sense which it has recently acquired, the superman. The later theology of the Church, according to which the human nature of Our Lord is impersonal (whatever be the exact meaning of that not very explanatory definition), is based upon this thought. Our Lord is not *a* man, but Man. "He alone," says Dr. Moberly

earliest Christianity. If we say that He represented humanity as perfected and so made divine, we speak more in the fashion of Buddhism than of Christianity. But of these interpretations the first is more consonant to the Jewish genius than the others" (P. Gardner, *Exploratio Evangelica*, p. 189, quoted in Nolloth, *Person of Our Lord*, p. 106, n. 2). Dr. Gardner's book was written in 1899 (2nd ed. 1907), i.e. before much attention had been called to the apocalyptic literature. So also Dr. Sanday: "It seems to me that Our Lord must have regarded Himself as in some manner representing Humanity. The idea of 'representing' may seem to be too modern; and the idea of embodying an ideal humanity may seem to be more modern still. I do not know exactly what expression to use so as to avoid this. An ancient might have had some difficulty in expressing the abstract idea; it seems to me that the word 'represent' is just what the ancients wanted. But, however that may be, I feel sure that there was a deep reality corresponding to it in the consciousness of Our Lord. The great passage to which I would appeal in proof is Mt. xxv. 31–46" (*Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 128).

[1] That is, if it be assumed that Our Lord spoke in that language. There is ground for believing that Greek was widely known in Palestine, especially in Galilee. Allen (*Oxford Studies*, p. 291) gives references to Schürer, Zahn, and Dalman on the subject. It has even been conjectured that the Greek phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου was sometimes used by Our Lord (Driver in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, iv, p. 583*a*; Plummer, *St. Matthew*, p. xxvi.). Prof. Dalman, who does not allow that it was a Messianic title, is sure that it cannot mean simply man (*Worte Jesu*, 1898, p. 191 f., Eng. tr., revised, 1902, p. 234 f.).

(and Dr. Temple's Essays in *Foundations* are largely an expansion of the idea) " was not generically, but inclusively man." [1]

The whole theological teaching of Dr. Du Bose, which has been referred to in an earlier chapter where the present argument was to some extent anticipated, is a profound exposition of the same great truth. One passage may be quoted here: " The Sonship realized and revealed to us in Jesus Christ is at once the final and the first cause of all things, of the whole creation. The universe comes to its majority and enters upon its inheritance in His person. If this seems an exaggerated and preposterous statement it is nevertheless just what is consistently and persistently maintained in the New Testament as a whole. And not only is it in many places, as we shall see, actually so stated, but the statement itself is in perfect harmony and keeping with the whole mind and truth of the sacred record and the faith of Christianity then and since." [2]

The thought is greatly helped by another two-sidedness in Our Lord's use of the term. It is, as was said in an earlier chapter, exceedingly difficult to determine how far Our Lord's prophetic vision, discerning *sub specie aeternitatis* the important, eternal things, and accordingly neglecting the time-plane in which the rest of us live too exclusively, led Him to foreshorten in His own mind that which has been the actual course of subsequent events. Anyhow, it may be said that the reference of the term " Son of Man " is mainly future, but the future in this connexion is regarded as having been to some extent anticipated and realized in the

[1] *Atonement and Personality*, p. 88. Cp. also: " His relation to the race was not a differentiating but a consummating relation . . . what others do but faintly suggest is realized in Him . . . the only relation which can at all directly compare with it is that of Adam; who in a real—though a primarily external and therefore inadequate—sense, was Humanity. . . . What if our limited being points towards, is real in God? If Christ's Humanity were not the Humanity of Deity, it could not stand in the wide, inclusive, consummating relation, in which it stands in fact, to the humanity of all other men. But as it is, the very essence of the Christian religion is the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ" (*Ibid.*, pp. 86–90; see also pp. 204–205). Cp. Dr. H. M. Relton (*A Study in Christology*, p. 228): " What was wanted was a revelation of One Who was Divine, and therefore perfectly and completely human, even if infinitely more than this. The human Ego in man is incomplete. The manhood of Christ, if it had possessed a human Ego only, would have been incomplete. Hence the Logos as its Ego was the sole condition which could secure its completeness. We may not speak of Christ's manhood as being real and complete except on one supposition—namely, that its personality was Divine. Though it might be purely human, it could not be truly or completely human without the Divine element."

[2] *The Gospel in the Gospels*, p. 224.

present. The explanation of this is surely that Our Lord's earthly life was of an inclusive kind. He passed through what may be called the necessary experience of mankind. His life is adequate as an example even to those whose lot is cast in a much later century and widely different conditions. But it was in itself of a preliminary character. It did require to be universalized by the Ascension and the Return at Pentecost, events which inaugurated a condition in which "in Christ there is no distinction."

S. Luke depicts for us the broad humanity of Jesus. He is also the historian of the Church. And he indicates in three ways the universalizing of which I have spoken.

(1) *Men and Women.* Among the many acute criticisms made by Mr. R. A. Knox on *Foundations*, there were few more piercing or more timely than his remark that the book "is always for discussing the difficulties of the modern man, as if the modern woman did not matter," and his further remark that "men become agnostics, but women become atheists."[1] An interest exhibited by women in politics is generally a sign that a fundamental question has been reached,[2] and on the answers that are forthcoming to the questions that women are asking about Christianity there depends the decision of the momentous alternative—are modern women going to be Christian with all the fervour of which they are capable, a fervour that few men can reach, or are they going to abandon Christianity altogether? We have seen already that there is an element of violence on the Third Gospel. It is S. Luke who tells us of the absurdity of rending a piece from a new garment to patch an old one; it is S. Luke who insists on the necessity, at least from time to time, of cutting old associations and abandoning old ties. It is women rather than men who are likely to appreciate this intensity of method and sharpness of logical result. And it is here rather than in the mere fact that Christianity enfranchises women that the appeal to women of the Faith in general, and of S. Luke's presentment of it in particular, will be found to lie.

[1] *Some Loose Stones*, pp. 16, 17. I cannot refrain from noting that he adds, after his first comment, "We should, I fancy, have heard a different story from Cambridge."

[2] "There were many women among them. Had our friend been older, he might have known that the presence of good women in a political crowd portends something" (Winston Churchill, *The Crisis* (1901), p. 144).

But the fact that Christianity does enfranchise women is in itself of great importance. Professor Murray, in the passage quoted in the last chapter, said that Christianity was assisted by the special appeal that it made to women. This is quite true. Mithraism, the most popular of the heathen religions, was, like Islam, a religion for men only. And under not a few of the systems that were contemporaries and rivals of early Christianity, it is hardly too much to say that a woman's only chance of salvation was to be born again, and this time to be born a man.

Christianity stands in sharp contrast with this. Even S. Paul is much more enlightened than is sometimes thought. Part of his apparently low view of marriage in 1 Cor. vii. is explained by the circumstance that he is answering a question, by the facts of existing Hellenic life, and by his expectation of the Parousia, and part of it is balanced and improved by his later, developed teaching in Eph. v. And even before he wrote 1 Corinthians he had put into words that which is the great Christian charter of womanhood—" there is neither male nor female ; for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus " (Gal. iii. 28).[1] And at any rate S. Luke, helped possibly by his experience as a physician, has written a Gospel in which women play an important part. In Acts he notes with sympathy how the women of the Macedonian cities respond to the preaching of S. Paul. We have already examined his point of view in the first two chapters. In general, the women of his Gospel are many, and are also essential to the bringing out of the full meaning of the Lord's work.

I am unable to say how far S. Luke would have been able to work out for himself that " in Him is neither male nor female," nor how exactly he would have connected the Pauline principle with any specific doctrine of Christ's universal humanity.[2] It

[1] Our Lord is traditionally reported to have made, in reply to the question, " When shall the kingdom come ? " the following answer, " When the two shall be one, and that which is without as that which is within, and the male with the female, neither male nor female " (Ps.-Clem. 12, perhaps quoted from the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*). The same tradition is referred to more than once by Clement of Alexandria, but it seems too " mystical " to be authentic.

[2] " The doctrine of the representative or inclusive manhood of Christ . . . was never actually formulated by S. Paul himself, for the abstract phraseology required for its formulation belongs to another age than his. Yet there can be no doubt that over and over again in his writings we come across the substance of the doctrine, and to recognize its presence there is essential to the understanding of Pauline thought " (O. C. Quick, *Essays in Orthodoxy*, p. 101).

is probable that he would have been rather surprised by the present analysis of his own tendency, but the materials for the conclusion that Our Lord's character is not exclusively male is largely supplied by him. The conclusion itself can hardly be doubted by any believer in the Incarnation, or even any reader of the Gospels. The old proof of it, based on His gentleness and tenderness, still stands as strong as ever, but it has been reinforced by the complementary observation of the thoroughgoing, even violent elements of Our Lord's character. And it can hardly be doubted that some of the things which have been said, especially in the Middle Ages, about Our Lady and the women saints, have owed their measure of exaggeration to a failure to comprehend the Catholic doctrine of Our Lord's own humanity.[1] It is, of course, impossible to suppose that His correction of an impulsive speaker in Lk. xi. 28 ("Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it") was actually intended as a warning against subsequent over-veneration of His Mother in the Church, but the principle implied, and more clearly indicated in Lk. viii. 21 ("My mother and my brethren are they who hear the word of God and do it"), is the principle which is contained in the Catholic doctrine of Christ's Body, which is the Church. That Our Lord was Himself actually of the male sex is indisputable. It is also the fact that He was a Jew, a poor man, and that He followed a specific trade. But no Christian denies that Gentiles, of all stations and occupations, find in His life the example that they need. The sex-division is deeper than any of these, but the humanity of Christ is deeper still. A true humanity is that which counts nothing human as alien from itself. The classical definition of the meaning of the word "Catholic" as applied to belief is *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est.* If the Catholicity of Our Lord's human nature be put to this test, it will only pass if His nature be found, as it is found, to include in itself the excellences not only of one sex, but of them both.[1]

[1] I mean, of course, only such things as tend to isolate the saints and to consider them apart from Christ. Considered truly, those reflections of the universal *Lux Mundi*, which are seen in such lives as those of Mary Magdalene, Perpetua, Hilda, Teresa, the Lady Margaret, and, above all, the Mother of the Lord, are of inestimable value, and are worth far more study than they commonly receive.

[2] "There are differences again between the male and female character, under which, nevertheless, we divine that there lies a real identity, and a consequent tendency to

And, as I have said, it is S. Luke who brings this out more clearly than any other writer of the New Testament. From the time when he lets us see that the first Christian was Mary, when God did not abhor the Virgin's womb, to the later pages in which we perceive how the permanent presence of the Ascended Lord was expressed in that long, gradual, impersonal incarnation of the Christ-Spirit which we call the Church, he is depicting a *Christus Consummator*, Who, being " poor " in that wherein most men and women find the best augmentation of their individual life, is yet able to " make many rich " in that He exhibits in Himself, and can bestow on others, the completed possibility not of one-half of the race, but of the whole.

(2) *Good and Bad.* S. Luke's Gospel is a Gospel of sacrifice and a Gospel for sinners. It contains the word " sinners " more often than the other three put together. S. Luke's Son of Man " came to seek and to save that which was lost " (xix. 10). See especially v. 30, 32, vii. 34, xv. 2, xix. 7. His account of the Temptation contains the significant addition, " the devil departed from him *for a season*." He makes the Lord say later (xxii. 28), " Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations." He characteristically connects the Baptism of Jesus with the Baptism of the multitude (iii. 21). In S. Luke (vii. 37) the woman who anoints Our Lord is a notorious sinner. S. Luke connects the saying about taking up the Cross and the first prediction of the Passion with the confession of Peter. S. Luke relates how the Lord said to the women of Jerusalem, " Weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children." And the parables, the Lost Sheep, the Lost Son, the Publican, and others, tell the same story. He means—it is almost too obvious to need mention—that Christianity is not a religion only for the good, but for every one, especially the bad. " ' Christianity is the religion of all poor devils,' the German Jew Börne said." [1]

fusion in the ultimate ideal. Had the Gospel type of character been stamped with the peculiar marks of either sex, we should have felt that there was an ideal free from those peculiarities beyond it. But this is not the case. It exhibits, indeed, the peculiarly male virtue of courage in the highest degree, and in the form in which it is most clear of mere animal impetuosity and most evidently a virtue ; but this form is the one common to both sexes, as the annals of martyrdom prove " (Goldwin Smith, *Lectures on the Study of History*, quoted in Westcott, *Historic Faith*, p. 231).

[1] T. R. Glover, *Nature and Purpose of a Christian Society*, p. 34.

There is just one point that is perhaps not quite obvious. It is sometimes thought that he is too uncritical, that his parables forgive too easily, that he underestimates the strength of the virus of iniquity. It is true that he is not one of the "twice-born," desperately contending souls, like S. Paul or S. Augustine. And it is true that his version of the parables that he has in common with S. Matthew lack something of the sternness which characterizes the Gospel that has been described as "Jehovah's ultimatum to His people." But whenever it seems in a hard moment that perhaps the Prodigal is not really quite penitent enough or that we ought to have been told more clearly that Mary Magdalene had turned in loathing from her former life, it must be remembered that it is Jesus Who speaks the parable, that it was Jesus Who converted and healed the prostitute. And in His presence sin dies and penitence is born. "We who have died to sin, how can we any longer live in it?"

It is not for a moment to be supposed that S. Luke commits himself in any way to the erroneous conclusion, against which S. Paul so indignantly protests, that it is a good thing to have sinned; that, in the words of some of the more crude of modern Evangelists, "God loves a great big sinner"; that it is a good thing to tempt the Lord your God by experimenting to see whether He will be able to make grace abound. The returned Prodigal has the ring and the shoes and the robe, and there is music and dancing in honour of his reclamation, but to the elder brother the father says, "Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine." He was not so un-Christian or so foolish as to believe in doing evil that good may come. But his Christ is the Friend of sinners. He believed in grace. The carefully balanced statement of S. Paul is one which he would heartily approve, "God sent His Son into the world in the likeness of sinful flesh." Not "in the likeness of flesh," which would destroy the reality of the Incarnation. Not "in sinful flesh," which would destroy the efficacy of the Redemption. But "in the likeness of sinful flesh," the Saviour among sinners.

(3) *Nationalism and Internationalism.* One of our present problems, which has in some directions been postponed, and in others has been made more urgent by the war, is how to avoid

the evils of the baser sort of nationalism, and see our way to an internationalism which shall not be merely cosmopolitan. To the history of Judaism, as it was summed up in the person of its Messiah, we naturally turn for illumination. We have seen already that the background of S. Luke's Gospel (and indeed of all the Gospels) is intensely Jewish. And yet it is the fact that in Christ the old distinctions have to a considerable extent not broken down but ceased to be what they were.

It is true, of course, that the Gospel was helped by circumstances—or perhaps rather it ought to be said, in the Pauline way, that it came in "the fulness of time." It came when the *Pax Romana* had just been established, when for the first time in the history of the world it became possible for business men and tourists to travel freely and safely wherever they desired, and when the Empire, with its immense geographical range and its policy of combining centralization with local freedom, had begun to dispose the minds of men in a cosmopolitan direction. All this was helpful. But it is not enough for opportunities to exist. They have to be seized and used. And it is a fact of history that the power which did convert political unity into moral and spiritual unity was the power of Christ. The Church kept alive the Empire much longer than it would otherwise have lived, and the Church eventually succeeded it.

"In Christ there is no distinction." How was it done? It was done by first filling and exhausting the meaning of Judaism. The principle appears to be that, in order to be a good internationalist, you must first be a good nationalist. It is no more a part of your Christian and Catholic duty to deny your nation than it is good citizenship to forget the family to which you have the honour to belong. "The theory," says Dr. Hamilton, "which presents Jesus as denying the unique authority and divine origin of the Jewish religion may be much more easily squared with certain systems of metaphysics, but it involves very serious historical difficulties." [1] Mr. Montefiore says that "he brought about the diffusion and universalization of some fundamental tenets of Judaism. . . . Though, in their highest moments, the Rabbinical authorities might say that Abraham was the father of

[1] *The People of God*, i, p. 226.

the proselyte quite as much as he was the ancestor of the born Jew, yet as a matter of fact the transference of Judaism to the Gentile upon any large and adequate scale was beset with difficulties. . . . The significance of Jesus for his age lies, then, in the fact that by certain elements in his teaching and by certain qualities in his personality he enabled these barriers of law and nationality to be broken down."[1] Mr. Montefiore writes from his own point of view, that of Liberal Judaism, and Christians will feel that there is much to be added to what he has here said. But as far as it goes his picture is truer than that of Mr. Houston Chamberlain, who practically denies that Our Lord was of Jewish race at all, and believes that His religion is (and was) of an Aryan and indeed anti-Semitic type.[2]

There is, of course, a truth in Mr. G. K. Chesterton's hasty dictum, "What nobody can possibly call Him is a Galilean of the time of Tiberius,"[3] because Our Lord held His Judaic nationality so easily and lightly, because He penetrated beneath its superficialities, and though He was "straitened" by them (Lk. xii. 50), yet He overpassed its limitations. But it remains unquestionable that He lived and died a Jew.[4]

The Gospel of S. Luke exhibits Our Lord as a practising member of the Jewish Church, willing to fulfil all such observances as are worthy of the name of righteousness. From the time when the birth of the forerunner is announced to the priest as he offers incense in the Temple, to the time when the veil of the same Temple is rent in twain at the Crucifixion, we may take it that there is being extracted from the Jewish Law the whole meaning which that Law is capable of yielding.[5] The hour has not yet come to pass beyond it. The exceptions are still excep-

[1] *Hibbert Journal*, July 1912, pp. 767, 772–773.

[2] *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*. Cp. Inge, *The Church and the Age*, p. 49.

[3] *Hibbert Journal*, July 1909, p. 748.

[4] "Both [the Rabbis and Jesus] are bone of the Jewish bone and spirit of its spirit" (Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, ii, p. 1098).

[5] "He did not say that He would destroy the Temple, but that, were it destroyed, He would raise it up again. When He purged it, He did not rend the veil or throw down the altar and its ornaments, saying: 'Take these things hence.' He drove forth those whose traffic dishonoured the sanctity of what He recognized as a house of prayer for all nations" (Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, p. 76).

tions to a rule.[1] Our Lord does not give any countenance to the desire that prevails nowadays in some circles—although, considered strictly as circles, they are rather lop-sided and irregular—to belong to more than one Church and to believe more than one religion at the same time. It is only when the Resurrection has burst the bounds in which human life is ordinarily confined that Our Lord enters upon an existence that has in it nothing specifically Jewish. With the Ascension the barriers, not only of race, but of space and time are swept away, and the Saviour becomes universally available. With Pentecost there is begun the application of the Christ-life to all the nations and to a l the generations of the world, and the Body of Christ is built up in Antioch and Philippi, Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome.

The process of Hellenization caused the Jewish origin to be obscured, in some cases to be forgotten or even repudiated. The stress of Jewish controversy in the second century produced not only in Marcion, but in others more orthodox, an anti-Semitic tendency. It is only with the dying down of acute controversy, and with the help of the good sense of men like Irenæus, that the Church was able to take a more reasonable view of the Old Testament, as an imperfect but genuine preparation for the Gospel. But Christianity does date in a real sense from Galilee. The Founder of the Catholic Church was the National Hero of the most intensely national nation that has ever been. It happens—by a paradox so striking that we must surely find some other name for it—that some of the Jews themselves had formed the habit of speaking of their expected Hero as the Son of Man. Who is this Son of Man? God is His Father, and the holy nation is His Mother. And for all His Jewish outlook, His national patriotism and His Galilean accent, He has overleaped the bounds of nationality and transcended the limitations of station, century, and sex; He has invented and alone can rightly wield an appeal which is divinely perfect, but also humanly complete; He has created—incidentally, and almost casually, in the course of His redeeming of man's soul—the only true democracy that is ever likely to exist. We may use of Him Matthew Arnold's lines

[1] E.g. the case of the Syro-Phœnician woman (Mk. vii. 24 f.; Mt. xv. 21 f.) is obviously exceptional. It is perhaps because the Gentiles are there described as "dogs" that S. Luke omits the passage.

on Shakespeare with a meaning far surpassing that of the original—

> Others abide our question. Thou art free.
> . . . . .
> All pains the immortal spirit must endure,
> All weakness which impairs, all griefs which bow,
> Find their sole speech in that victorious brow.

A time of war presents many parallels to the time described in the Gospels. Above all in two ways: (1) It is a time when the sense of nationality is deeply stirred and fiercely roused. The National Mission of 1916 and after, which was born of the necessities of war, was genuinely Christian in that it never pretended that Christianity is merely English. Its aim was not "Christ for England," but "England for Christ." But some of the recrudescence of religion that we have witnessed in England since 1914 has been a recrudescence of something that is infinitely less than Christianity, a flamboyant "patriotism," to which, for emphasis, the name of God has been attached. Those who have had patience to read through this book are not likely to be such as to be carried away by this crude exuberance. Yet the great majority of them are accustomed, as I think, rightly, to discern in the character of their fellow-countrymen a notable reflection of the supreme and universal character of Christ. But in spite of this not a few of them, even after the lacerating experiences that have come to them during years of war, and even with resolute acceptance of the grim corollaries that follow inevitably from the initial responsibility of going to war, will still preserve the conviction, learned perhaps at Ober-Ammergau, that there is, too, a "German Christ." In the deepest sense there is, of course, no such thing. But nor is there any "English Christ." And those who are able to entertain the faith that out of chaos and ruin God is able to build up some better fabric than has been, that divine redemption rides upon the very wings of human storm, can look for its fulfilment nowhere but to Him "Who is our Peace, who hath made the two one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition." [1] The Christ, Who welded Jew and Gentile into one Body, and began

[1] Eph. ii. 14, 15.

the era in which the fulness of the Gentiles was to be gathered in and all Israel to be saved, is the only Giver of the means of grace by which Europe will be enabled to "repair the losses and heal the wounds of war." We can hardly wonder that any nation should be interested first in itself, and then in others. What is all-important is that they should remember that their task is nothing smaller than the upbuilding of Christ's Body in the world.

(2) A time of war, like the time of Our Lord's Ministry, is a time of *Interimsethik*. I do not adopt the word in its extreme sense. But that a time of gigantic war can truly be described as "a time of visitation," a formative, creative period, a period in which new principles emerge, which principles are presently to be carried over into the less exciting, yet more stable, more constructive days that will ensue, or that it can be described in various other terms that are also an obvious description of the Gospel-time, will hardly be denied. At such a time soldiers at the front, and in a measure people at home, live under an *Interimsethik*. Can they claim to be "the little flock" to whom it is the Father's good pleasure "to give the kingdom"? They can, but whether or no the Father will bring His good pleasure to effect depends entirely on whether they are able to carry over, as primitive Christians did in the manner described by S. Luke, the initial, creative impetus of their blinding, overwhelming experience. The years of the Great War are, in a sense, the Gospel. They have renewed, for some at least, the sense of the nearness of the Son of Man, the White Companion; they have revealed afresh the divine significance of the Birth at Bethlehem, the Home at Nazareth; they have given a clearer understanding of what is meant by Crucifixion; they have produced a measure of that which may be called Resurrection and Ascension. Will the remainder of this century be worthy to be called The Acts of the Apostles, a real history of the Catholic Church in the world? S. Luke's writings furnish us with a complete statement of our problem, and the only indication of its ultimate solution.

The connexion of the former point with the immediate subject of internationalism was obvious. The connexion of this second matter of war-ethics is not less real. For if the main contention

of this book be not radically unsound, Our Lord's eschatology was carried—and was intended to be carried—into effect by the operation of the Church, His Body, "that wonderful and sacred mystery." "He spoke," says Dr. E. F. Scott in words that I gladly quote, "of a Kingdom which God would bring to pass by His own creative act; but the Church has felt the obligation laid upon it of assisting the work of God. By making disciples of all nations, by righting the world's injustices, and conforming all human institutions to the law of Christ, it has endeavoured to realize, in ever larger measure, that new age which He foretold. It may be argued that this attempt to fulfil His Kingdom through the faith and labour of Christian men can find no sanction in the teaching of Jesus. His own hope for the world's future fell to the ground, and was replaced by another, with which it had nothing in common. But when we look deeper, we can recognize that it was Jesus Himself Who inspired the activities of His Church. While He conceived of the Kingdom as the direct gift of God, He declared that men, by their own effort, might bring it nearer. In His own life He gave the example of an all-conquering faith, and sought to awaken a like faith in His people. Waiting on God, they were also to work with Him for the hastening of the Kingdom." [1]

And it is S. Luke who reveals this to us. The Jesus of his Gospel, living the Jew's life in the Jewish world, is nevertheless depicted as prepared, when the time shall come, to take the wings of the morning and abide in the uttermost parts both of the sea and of the land, there to live everlastingly in the lives of those who belong to His Body and perform His Will. The Acts is the classic of missionary literature. S. Luke's own status, as a Gentile Christian, was wholly due to the fact that the ship of the Church had burst its early moorings and had found him as he tossed, half drowned and perishing of hunger, cold, and nakedness, on the sea of the Hellenic world. He does not point his moral; his simple tale remains unadorned by theological inference. Such inferences are most fitly drawn by each generation in the language of its own day. In our day there is much that helps us to perceive that while Christ, as Very God of Very God, is

[1] *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, p. 145.

always perfect, yet His perfection is by degrees translated into terms of man's appropriation. The Incarnation of the Son of God is worked out and effected as the world begins to find Him and be found in Him.

S. Paul in Eph. ii. 20 speaks of the Church as "founded upon the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the head corner-stone." He elsewhere (1 Cor. iii. 11) uses the easier and more natural figure, in which Our Lord is regarded as being Himself the Foundation. But here he is thinking of Christ as the completion of the Church, the top stone that crowns the finished work. It is the characteristic thought of the Ephesian Epistle, and comes out most conspicuously in iv. 13—"unto the building up of the body of Christ, until we all come unto the oneness of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the completion of the Christ." "Christ the beginning and the End is Christ," or, as the Seer mystically puts it, "the Alpha and the Omega," or the Epistle to the Hebrews, "Jesus, the Author and the Finisher of our faith." It is impossible—be it noted once again—to say how far S. Luke had grasped this sublime thought. Its full analysis was perhaps far beyond him, but he was feeling after it, if haply Theophilus or we might find it. Like those four friends of the afflicted man whom he describes, he carries such as desire healing and salvation into the presence of Him Who, first in the days of His flesh and then in the era of His Spirit, communicates to wandering or stricken souls "the wholesome medicine" of His redeeming and regenerating Life.

NOTE ON THE DATE OF THE GOSPEL

THERE is no good reason to doubt the traditional and well-attested belief that the Gospel was written by the author whose name it bears. It is not necessary, therefore, in this note to take into consideration the very late date, approaching the middle of the second century, which was assigned to the Gospel by some of the writers of the Tübingen school, but is now generally abandoned. Among the suggested dates which are compatible with Lukan authorship the most important are as follows:

(1) *c.* A.D. 100. The determining argument in this case is an alleged acquaintance on the part of the author with certain passages in Josephus, who published his *Antiquities* in A.D. 93 or 94. (*a*) Lk. iii. 1, 2 records that "in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius . . . Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and Philip, his brother, tetrarch of the region of Ituræa and Trachonitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene . . . the word of God came to John." Josephus says (*Ant.* xviii. 4, 6) that "Philip, Herod's brother, died in the twentieth year of the reign of Tiberius, after he had been tetrarch of Trachonitis . . . thirty-seven years." This resemblance of language proves nothing at all, but there is another passage which has been thought to account for S. Luke's mention of Abilene and Lysanias. It is in any case possible that the reference to Lysanias is a chronological error, because an official or king of that name, who had ruled "over the hill country of the Ituræans" (Strabo), was put to death in 36 B.C.[1] But it also happens that Josephus (*Ant.* xx. 7, 1), after mentioning the two regions of Trachonitis and Abila, adds that the latter "had been the tetrarchy of Lysanias." This is thought to prove that S. Luke had (somewhat carelessly) read Josephus, though it seems easier to conclude either that he knew of a second Lysanias, a tetrarch, or that he made a mistake about Lysanias, and, if the latter, that both his mistake and the manner of Josephus' reference are due to the fact that the name of Lysanias was for some reason still connected with Abilene. (*b*) In Acts v. 36, 37 Gamaliel refers first to Theudas and then to Judas the Galilean, who revolted "in the days of the enrolment." It seems that the two incidents really happened in the reverse order,[2] and the revolt of Theudas had not taken place at the date when Gamaliel is supposed to be speaking. Josephus in *Ant.* xx. 5, 1 mentions the revolt of Theudas, and some twenty lines later (xx. 5, 2), "Judas of Galilee . . . who caused the people to revolt, when Cyrenius came to take an account of the estates of the Jews." The evidence for dependence here is stronger than in the other case, and the two together have convinced Professor Burkitt (*Gospel History*, pp. 105–110), but it is at least equally probable that both S. Luke and Josephus are indebted to some lost source or to common knowledge. It must be remembered that, as no Christian was present at the meeting of the Sanhedrin, S. Luke's version of the speech can only be what he supposed to have been said. Further, if the arguments of Sir William Ramsay (see p. 152 f.) are sound, S. Luke was thoroughly acquainted with all the facts about Cyrenius, and would not depend on inaccurate recollection of a casual mention in Josephus.

The negative evidence to the effect that S. Luke had not read Josephus is very strong.

---

[1] Ramsay (*The Bearing of Recent Research*, etc., p. 297 f.) quotes evidence from an inscription found on the site of the ancient Abila, which satisfies him that one Lysanias was a tetrarch at some time between A.D. 14 and 29. This period would cover the Lukan date.

[2] "The *hysteron-proteron* is not proved beyond a doubt. It is also possible that there is a mistake in Josephus" (Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, p. 123, n. 1).

It seems incredible that, if he had, the result should appear only in the two passages quoted. Harnack writes, "The time of Josephus need not be taken into consideration; for the theory that the author of the Acts had read that historian is quite baseless" (*Luke the Physician*, p. 24, n. 2).

(2) A.D. 75–80. The chief argument for this date is the fact that S. Luke substitutes for the mysterious reference to "the abomination of desolation" the more specific and more intelligible phrase "Jerusalem surrounded by armies."[1] This is often said to be a *vaticinium post eventum*. But, if so, it is very vague, and as a matter of fact history contains some far more astonishing anticipations of future events than the language of S. Luke. Thus, Blass (*Philology of the Gospels*, p. 41 f.) points out that Savonarola's predictions, in sermons that were preached in 1496 and printed in 1497, of the capture of Rome, were fulfilled with singular precision of detail in 1527. On the whole it may be said that while this date allows time for the drawing up of "many" previous narratives (Lk. i. 1), and satisfactorily accounts for some of the general phenomena of the Gospel, e.g. the occasional but not consistent use of ὁ κύριος, the reasons in its favour are not overwhelming.

(3) *c.* A.D. 63. The argument for this date is that Acts must have been written very soon after the end of the events which it describes, i.e. before S. Paul's death (see above, p. 189, n. 2). If this was so, the Gospel must have been still earlier. Harnack (*Date of Acts*, etc., p. 99) considers this "in the highest degree probable."[2] Moreover, no use is made in either the Gospel or Acts of the Epistles of S. Paul. Mr. Edmundson (*The Church in Rome during the First Century*, p. 67, n. 4), who believes that the Gospel was based, not on S. Mark as we now know it, but on "a number of separate lections or instructions written by S. Mark previously for the use of Greek-speaking converts in Judæa," assigns the writing of S. Luke's Gospel to Cæsarea during the two years of S. Paul's captivity in that place. He would find the Petrine lections in the possession of Philip.

---

[1] S. Luke's omission of this Old Testament reference (Dan. ix. 27, xi. 31, xii. 11) obliges him also to omit the explanatory note, "let him that readeth understand," which is found in Mk. and Mt.

[2] Cp. *ibid.*, p. 124: "It now seems to be established beyond question that both books of this great historical work were written while St. Paul was still alive."

NOTE ON THE "WESTERN" READINGS

THE margin of the Revised Version from time to time records that "some" or "many" "ancient authorities" either insert or omit certain words. In some cases these authorities comprise the group of witnesses for what is traditionally known as the "Western Text." The group consists of one Greek Uncial MS., *Codex Bezæ* (D), the oldest copies of the Latin Version, the oldest copies of the Syriac Version, and a number of early Patristic quotations. This evidence carries us back to a date considerably earlier than that of the actual writing of the great Greek Uncials, *Vaticanus* and *Sinaiticus*, and it comes from places as far apart as Carthage and Edessa.

The peculiarities of the group, which is not in every case fully represented, are mainly of two kinds:

(1) Additions. For example, in Lk. ix. 55 the Western Text adds, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of Man came not to destroy, but to save."

(2) Omissions. There is a series of omissions in Lk. xxii.–xxiv. (e.g. xxii. 19*b*, 20; xxiii. 34; xxiv. 12, 36, 40, 51; see also Mt. xxvii. 49), which Westcott and Hort describe as "non-interpolations." They believe that the Western Text has, so to speak, resisted the temptation to interpolate in these places, and so preserves the original reading. *N.B.*—The passages may or may not represent what actually occurred or was said. We are here only concerned with their claim to be parts of S. Luke's text.

(There is a very interesting addition, after Lk. vi. 4, about the man working on the Sabbath, for which D is the sole authority, and there are also in D some very curious paraphrases in the text of Acts.)

Westcott and Hort in 1885 were disposed to follow the Western Text in its omissions, but not in its additions. The discovery (in 1892) of the Sinaitic Syriac Version, and the further examination of patristic texts (e.g. the text of Clement of Alexandria, by Mr. P. M. Barnard), have added to the evidence, and many scholars now assign great weight, not particularly to D, but to the agreements of the Old or "African" Latin and the Old Syriac.

Dr. Rendel Harris has sought to explain many of the readings as due to glosses in the Latin version, which found their way into the Greek. Dr. Chase has a counter-theory of Syriac influence. Professor Blass maintains that both types of text are Lukan, and that the Evangelist addressed his first version (the non-Western Text) to Theophilus, and afterwards published another version (the Western Text) for the use of the Roman Church.

On the whole, the question of the date and provenance of the text, and of the degree of authority which should be assigned to it, must be regarded as still *sub judice*. See the verdict of Professor Stanton, quoted on p. 69, n. 3.

INDEX

PASSAGES OF S. LUKE'S GOSPEL REFERRED TO IN THE TEXT

	PAGE
I: 1	126
1–4	63, 124, 148, 151
5	64, 150, 157
7	154
16	186
24–26	154
39–44	154
39	151
43	166
46	65
52	40
56	65, 154
65	151
II: 2 f.	65, 153, 169
15	169
19	154
22 f.	91
25	42
32	151
33	171
34	154
36	91
38	42, 91
41	171
42	91
45	65
47	163
48	65, 154, 171, 193
49	65
50	172
51	154
52	163, 172
III: 1	65, 135, 147, 229
2	229
7	66, 203
8	92, 207
10	66
11–15	155
17	92
III: 21	117, 219
22	66, 173
23 f.	66
IV: 1 f.	99, 219
13	99
14	91
15	181
16 f.	15, 66, 91, 179
21	103
22	170, 194
23	78, 192
29	114
31	135
35	89
38	193
40	89
43	37
V: 1–11	66, 84, 87, 118
4–10	191
8	195
12 f.	193
14	91
19	95
20	207
23–24	123
25	191
26	182, 192
27–38	122
30	219
31	27, 192
32	118, 219
34	103, 115
36	95
39	92
VI: 3	91
4	130, 231
5	214
10	89
12	117

PAGE

VI: 12–16 . . . 67, 127
15 190
17–49 67
20 f. . . . 116, 135, 136
32 . . . . 118, 190
34 118
46 101
VII: 2–10 137
3 87
5 91
9 98
11–17 . . 66, 77, 83, 87
11 117
13 94
18–35 67
22 . . . . 33, 103, 136
27 30
28 . . . . 30, 92
30 190
32 112
34 . . . . 187, 219
36 f. . . . 66, 90, 112, 194
37 . . . . 89, 219
40–50 . . . 117, 191, 220
50 118
VIII: 1 . . . 37, 66, 194
2 . . . . 117, 192
3 . . . . 117, 147
4 . . . . 127, 135
6 193
7 192
10 196
11 97
15 190
18 126
19 93
20 171
21 . . . 93, 218
22–25 132
25 183
38 15
39 . . . . 15, 183
43 . . . . 192, 207
44 131
48 118
IX: 2 37
7 147
9 199
12–17 133
13 122
14 . . . . 135, 139
16 133

PAGE

IX: 18 . . 67, 117, 122, 187
20 113
23 . . . 17, 114, 126, 198
24 . . . . 114, 126
28–36 . . 67, 182, 185, 203
28 117
29 . . . 66, 122, 133
31 122
33 95
35 40
39 193
43 181
44 142
45 . . . . 95, 187
47 122
50 68
51 . 67, 68, 107, 143, 183, 193, 194
54 107
55 231
56 199
57 . . . . 107, 198
58 213
X: 1 94
2–16 91
7–8 30
13 78
15–16 44
16 17
16–21 69
17 68
18 . . . . 99, 103, 184
21 14
22 . . . . 43, 136, 184
23 103
25 190
25–37 . 68, 95, 191, 193, 194, 195
26 91
28 29
29 . . . . 29, 112
30 193
33 67
38–42 . 68, 144, 191, 194, 195
XI: 1–4 . . . 68, 144
1 117
2 100
3 198
5–8 117
5 . . . . 184, 196
15 66
20 . . . . 37, 103, 185
22 184
24–26 95

PAGE

XI: 27 . . 117, 145, 198
28 218
29 . . . . 33, 192
31–32 . . . 44, 185
37–40 90
41 115
42 197
43 . . . . 126, 185
45 . . . . 112, 190
47 191
49 43
52 195
53 190
XII: 8 44
13 f. . . . 68, 112, 120, 208
16 f. . . . 100, 120, 195
28 185
29 . . . . 105, 191
32 59
33 . . . . 116, 139
35 . . . . 100, 144
49–51 . . . 107, 108
50 . . . . 123, 222
51 184
52 44
54 66
XIII: 1 f. . . 112, 182, 200
6–9 . . . . 88, 117
10 f. 145
12 . . . . 117, 191
15 90
16 92
22 68
23 . . . . 181, 198
24 181
26 207
27–29 98
31 112
32 . . . . 107, 199
34 . . . . 44, 114
35 101
XIV: 1 90
1–6 83
2 193
3 190
3–6 191
7–11 83
12–15 116
15 . . . . 112, 198
16–24 95
23 115
25 68

PAGE

XIV: 26 . . . . 44, 115
27 . . . . . 17, 44
28–33 198
31–32 65
33 . . . . 89, 115
XV: 2 219
8 . . . . 117, 145
11 119
11–32 . . 119 f., 191, 220
16 199
XVI: 1–13 . . . 68, 196
8 40
9 . . . . 40, 198
15 29
16 . . . 40, 103, 107
18 89
19–31 68
24–25 193
29–31 91
XVII: 1–2 193
3 89
7 f. 119
9–14 194
11–19 . . . 68, 83, 194
11 . . . . 67, 145
14 91
16 . . . . 67, 145
19 118
21 . . . . 103, 144
22 100
28 115
32 116
33 126
XVIII: 1–14 . . 69, 117
2 185
3 117
4 191
6–9 193
7 40
8 115
9–14 69
14 135
15–43 122
15 135
16 89
18 f. . . . 112, 210
19 33
29 37
31–34 142
34 . . . . 95, 187
42 118
43 181

PAGE

XIX: 1–10 . . 69, 89, 191, 194
7 219
9 . . . . . 92, 102
10 219
11 . . . . . 100, 147
12 65
14 65
22–25 191
26 126
27 101
37 181
38 101
41 . . . . . 108, 114
41–44 69
48 115

XX: 2 112
5–6 192
9 . . . . . 100, 119
9–18 95
16 191
25 197
27 190
28 192
37 92
45 90
46 126
47 191

XXI: 1–4 27
5 112
9 100
12 106
20 . . . . . 58, 69, 106
25 . . . . . 51, 78
26 56
28 . . . . . 40, 106
34–36 115
34 193
37 83
38 . . . . . 69, 83

XXII: 1 190
7–20 69
7–13 186
14 f. 69
15 f. 108, 114, 186
18 70
19 f. 69, 231
22 . . . . . 41, 107
24 112
25–26 123
27 . . . . . 69, 103
28 . . . . . 99, 219

PAGE

XXII: 30 92
31 . . . . . 186, 195
32 . . . . . 117, 195
35 116
38 194
39–43 70
40 f. 89
43–44 . . . . . 70, 186
45 89
48 194
51 193
52 186
53 108
54–63 76
61 . . . . . 94, 114, 199
67–71 183
69 . . . . . 57, 104, 106, 213

XXIII: 2 65
4–7 203
6–12 70
9–10 83
11 f. 199
14–20 203
27–31 70
27 103
28 . . . . . 117, 198
29 115
34 231
35 . . . . . 40, 192, 195
39–43 70
43 89
47 183
48–49 191

XXIV: 6 72
10 . . . . . 147, 155
11 95
12 231
13–32 . . . . . 83, 200 f.
25–27 108
34 . . . . . 71, 86
36 231
38 71
39 . . . . . 71, 83
40 231
41–43 75
43 72
44–49 71
44–46 72
44 108
46 65
47–49 106
51 . . . . . 72, 231

GENERAL INDEX

ABBOTT, E. A., 106, 110, 127, 156, 191, 197, 213
Acta of Jerusalem, 13
Allen, W. C., 129, 138 f., 142
Anderson, K.C., 32
Antioch, 19, 20
Apocalyptic books, 35 f., 54
Apocryphal Gospels, 162 f.
Arnold, Matthew, 50, 208
Ascension of Isaiah, 71
Asceticism, 115 f., 209
Augustine, 58, 120, 173, 196, 220

BACON, B. W., 50, 66, 137
Baker, J. F. Bethune, 183
Barnard, P. M., 231
Barrett, Sir W. F., 158
Bartlet, J. V., 139, 145
Bede, 83
Blass, F., 19, 63, 124, 230, 231
Blougram, 77
Bousset, W., 30
Box, G. H., 35, 156, 171
Brace, G. L., 210
Bruce, A. B., 81, 213
Burkitt, F. C., 7, 8, 32, 35, 49, 51, 53, 65, 67, 75, 80, 117, 125, 130, 133, 134, 137, 138, 209, 211, 229

CALLISTA, 8
Carrington, P., 103
Charles, R. H., 35, 37, 40, 49
Chase, F. H., 11, 73, 155, 189
Chesterton, G. K., 97, 184, 222
Church, the, Pauline doctrine of, 16 f.
Circumincessio, 56
Clemen, C., 28
" Contamination," 88 f., 95
Conybeare, F. C., 33
Cowper, B. H., 164
Criticism, 81 f.
Cross, the, 46, 108, 113, 185

DALMAN, Prof., 214
Dante, 106, 199
Deissmann, A., 22, 69, 150, 152, 210
Didache, 69, 94, 102, 115
Divinity of our Lord, 44 f., 183
Dobschütz, von, 54, 101, 104
Docetists, 74, 80, 90, 132
Doublets, 125, 133
Drews, A., 32
Du Bose, W. P., 119, 160, 165, 198, 215
Dyce, W., 99

EBIONISM, 116, 209
Ebionite Gospel, 173
Edersheim, A., 91, 124
Edmundson, G., 230
Emmet, C. W., 35, 51, 65, 88, 105
Enoch, Similitudes of, 38 f., 212
Epistles of New Testament, 6
Eschatologists, 51 f.
Eucharist, the, 58, 60, 69 f., 77, 186, 202
Eusebius, 20, 49, 66, 69, 71, 140

FERRAR Group, the, 69
Figgis, J. N., 23
Findlay, Prof., 164
Foundations, 80, 99

GARDNER, P., 25, 28, 83, 152, 214
Genealogy, the, 66
Glover, T. R., 111 f., 200, 210, 219
Goldwin Smith, 219
Gore, C., 77
Gospel of Peter, 71, 94
Graham, Stephen, 116
Green, P., 197

HAGUE, W. V., 40
Hamilton, H. H., 28, 221
Harnack, 6, 14, 19, 25, 37, 44, 47, 50, 53, 81, 83, 86, 126, 136, 141, 143, 148, 154, 156, 166, 186, 193, 229
Harris, J. R., 231

Hart, J. H. A., 53
Hawkins, J. C., 10, 14, 15, 67, 68, 124, 130, 131, 134, 138, 139, 143, 144, 146
Headlam, A. C., 51
Herod, 146, 199 f.
Hobart, Dr., 192
Holland, H. S., 92
Hort, F. J. A., 18, 72

Idealization, 168 f.
Ignatius, 71
Incarnation, the, 26 f., 45 f., 76, 159 f., 206 f., 218 f.
Inge, W. R., 55, 222
Interimsethik, 52, 97, 105, 225
Internationalism, 221
"Interpolation, the Great," 67 f., 143 f.
Irenæus, 65, 160

Jackson, H. L., 35, 47, 114, 127
Jacks, L. P., 47
Jerome, 64, 71
Joanna, 78, 147
Josephus, 32, 152, 229
Jülicher, 31, 81
Justin, 102

Kennedy, H. A. A., 149
Kenyon, F. G., 141
Kingdom, the, 36 f., 42, 103 f.
Knight, H. J. C., 17
Knox, R. A., 216
Knowling, R. J., 25

Lacey, T. A., 22, 25, 79, 80
Lake, K., 19, 28, 34, 48, 49, 53, 83, 153, 213
Lang, Andrew, 98
Liberal Protestants, 50
Lightfoot, J. B., 71
Little, A. G., 197
Logia, 63, 140
Loisy, A., 25, 37, 65, 81, 87, 152, 177

Magnificat, the, 65, 167, 211
Manaen, 147
Marcan Source, 126 f.
Marcion, 81, 98, 118
Maurice, F. D., 7, 120, 167, 196
Maurier, Du, 194
McNeile, A. H., 37, 53, 172
Medical language, 192 f.
Messiah, 36 f., 44, 96 f., 110, 213 f.
Miracles, 75 f., 133, 162 f., 171
Mithraism, 24, 217
Moberly, R. C., 214
Moffatt, J., 49, 66, 68, 81, 89, 138
Montefiore, C. G., 77, 103, 105, 221 f.
Montgomery, 53
Moulton, J. H., 14, 27, 141, 146, 150
Mozley, J. K., 210
Murray, G., 205, 206, 217
Mystery-religions, 24, 28, 205
Mythological School, 24, 28, 32, 51, 74
Mythopœic Faculty, 162

Neumann, Arno, 33
New Testament, 5 f.
Nolloth, C. F., 43
Niceta of Remesiana, 65

Oesterley, W. O., 35
"Omission, the Great," 131 f.
Oral Theory, the, 123 f.
Origen, 64, 71, 107, 116
Oxyrhynchus Sayings, 103, 143

Paley, 76
Papias, 140
Parables, the, 112, 196
Passion, S. Luke's account of, 69 f., 145 f.
Passover, the, 186
Paulinism, 81, 118 f.
Peabody, F. G., 104
Pentecost, 11, 21 f., 55 f., 102, 107, 216, 223
Perichoresis, 56
Peter, call of, 84 f.
Philippi, 15 f., 20
Pfleiderer, 22
Plummer, A., 14, 66, 95, 113, 198
Prayer, 116 f.

"Q," 44, 78, 79, 126, 136 f.
Quick, O. C., 217
Quirinius, 151 f.

Ramsay, Sir Wm., 15, 20, 26, 65, 129, 147, 152, 153, 168, 193
Relton, H. M., 215
Renan, E., 32
Robertson, J. M., 32
Robinson, J. A., 17, 164
Rogers, H., 33
Royce, Prof., 206

Salmon, G., 86, 142
Sanday, W., 7, 17, 49, 51, 55, 76, 91, 118, 131, 134, 151, 154, 184, 214
Schmiedel, P. W., 33, 81, 84 f., 113, 118
Schweitzer, A., 48, 51 f., 77, 102
Scott, C. A. A., 30, 70, 81
Scott, E. F., 36, 41 44, 51, 108, 213, 226
Selwyn, E. G., 51, 57
Semitisms, 149 f.
Seneca, 204
Seventy, the, 68, 145
Smith, B. D. T., 23
Smith, W. B., 32
Soden, von, 143, 189, 193
Son of Man, 38 f., 110 f., 214 f.
Souter, A., 20
Stanton, V. H., 14, 27, 58, 69 f., 112, 138, 139
Stawell, F. M., 20
Storr, V. F., 71
Streeter, B. H., 49, 55, 88, 99, 100, 137, 139, 141, 143, 144
Suetonius, 33
Swete, H. B., 72, 73, 134

Tacitus, 33
Tatian's *Diatessaron*, 8
Temple, W., 57, 215
Temptation, the, 99, 219
Theophilus, 7, 64, 81, 124, 191
Tiberius, fifteenth year of, 65
Tragic irony, 194
Transfiguration, the, 114, 185
Transmuted eschatology, 96, 101 f.
Trench, R. C., 119, 196
Troas, 13 f.
Turner, C. H., 65, 130, 152, 180
Tyrrell, G., 51, 53, 54, 104, 222
Tübingen School, 86

Underhill, E., 87
Ur-Markus, 128, 134
Usener, Prof., 156

Vaughan, R., 71
Verrall, A. W., 199

Weiss, J., 26, 32, 51
Weiss, B., 81
Wellhausen, J., 81, 181
Wells, H. G., 17, 168
" We-sections," 14 f., 19
Wernle, 31
Westcott, B. F., 55, 56, 58, 65, 68, 124, 231
Williams, N. P., 131
Winstanley, E. H., 103
Women, 117, 154, 216
Woods, F. H., 127
Wordsworth, C., 64
Wordsworth, J., 65
Wright, A., 66, 154, 200, 204

Zanzibar, Bishop of, 54
Zealots, 42

PRINTED AT THE COMPLETE PRESS
WEST NORWOOD, LONDON

Theology
Claremont
A11346

41873

BS2595 .C35
Carpenter, Spencer Cecil, 1877-
Christianity according to S. Luke /

BS
2595
C35

Carpenter, Spencer Cecil, 1877-

Christianity according to S. Luke, by the Rev. S. C. Carpenter ... London, Society for promoting Christian knowledge; New York, Macmillan company, 1919.

xii, 239 p. 24 cm.

"This book has grown out of some lectures delivered at Cambridge in August 1915 to the members of the Vacation school of Biblical studies."—Pref.

Includes bibliographical references.

1. Bible. N. T. Luke—Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Title.

Library of Congress BS2595.C35

CCSC/ef

A/1346